



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0891LA-1 for Jefferson Parish Public School System

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Fidelity of plan implementation and development opportunities is grounded in the commitment to close 9 underperforming schools, after "the most dramatic of federal interventions." The applicant closed or consolidated based on multi-year failures. The reform needed to improve instruction is based on a leader making the decision to remove 22 principals. A comprehensive and coherent vision of quality supporting master teachers, support specialists, and TAP program is starting to show results. This is evidenced by the Value Added Assessments. Teachers are trained and held accountable through high quality evaluation structure aligned to the implementation of common core standards into the curriculum.</p> <p>The plan strives to pull forward ongoing desperately needed school reforms to engage student learners and align them to graduation and career-ready transitions to postsecondary instruction. The deep pledge to develop additional instructional resources and to create a series of crosswalks bring LEA's into compliance with CCSS.</p> <p>The graduation rate has improved by a percent over the last year 67%-68% . A main criterion unaddressed is high schools students and career and college readiness alongside graduation rates. There are gap closures around similar subgroups characteristics at 3.4 scale points, and the JPPS aims to outperform the state average rate.</p> <p>Data shows with the implementation of A-Net school in 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 a two year record of student achievement. Additionally, 50% of the staff were removed in underperforming schools, and now one foundational key goal of the implementation plan is training and or selecting high performing instructors. 16,000 students are significantly impacted by the shifts in the educational foundation. Still, skill gaps exist and the timeline falls short of the 4 year benchmark of success.</p> <p>The plan assigns a huge record number of student transfers as a way to improve and assess accountability. Articulating a complete turn-around with diverse student populations is changing the school landscape of the district; where enrollments declined by 25% in part due to a natural disaster. However, changing location does not ensure a successful school. A personalized student support structure/framework is necessary to outline and describe for this application.</p> <p>The largest school district in Louisiana supports "urban, rural, and high poverty students. 76% on free and reduced lunch." The extent to which the plan supports high quality learning to reach outcome goals is evidenced and documented by a central office reorganization. The transitions to a new network model (portfolio model) suggests "turnaround" is the plan of engagement (SIG) connecting the students to a framework of support.</p> <p>The arch of the plan is reorganization, restructuring, and creating rapid reform for the district to not have federal or state oversight.</p> <p>The JPPSS vision for teaching and learning "is both academic and non-academic". Four dimensional/distinct projects adjudicates existing reforms and creates other ones for implementation to meet the standards of the statewide system, but information reflects the school reform needed has to begin at a constructive and realistic portal based on significant past failures. The JPPSS system is aligning for strategic and wholistic improvement as evidenced by summative assessments that close Leap test gaps by (3%) across subgroups.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p>		

(a) Schools invited to participate in the selection process and that approach is reasonable. However, no real information is given on the process the applicant used to garner support. There is a critical need for implementing personalized instruction, and the approach to complete this key goal is a strong, solid, approach, based on research and use of intensive data. The reorganization of the Central Office is one process used to leverage a district-wide Achievement Network, this is ambitious, and a reachable criterion. The competition's eligibility requirements are met through rapid rates of growth in Sy s011-2012 where LEAP scores grew 4.1 percent and 4.2 percent, a strong proof of transformative instruction.

(b) Referenced in appendix with letters of support that lists participating schools, teacher, administrators, and student signatures. 76% on free or reduced lunch, high poverty schools, and about 46,000 students.

c) Still, over 70% of teachers support the proposal with some participating schools over 90%. There are a myriad of letters and supports and a list of participating schools in the appendix. The applicant did not highlight any high performing schools based on the criteria for high performance based schools. This application discusses turn-around, but does not establish a baseline for goals or criteria based on individual student learning. Participating students, who are high need students, would receive a high performing teacher: yet details were vague on how the school system would define a high performing instructor, or how the instructor would be trained through on-going professional development measurements.

The focus on elementary and middle-school is understandable, given that is likely where much improvement can occur, but it does not take into account the particular scope and magnitude of this grant application. High quality school implementation is evidenced by Central office reorganization, transition to a network model, new human capital policies, closing or turning around failing schools, and adopting Common Core State Standards. Appraisal of the grade bands cover and project the plan implementation over math, Language Arts, Critical-thinking skills, problem-solving across all grade levels. More emphasis, however, is placed on the reporting and alignment of 8th grade student to the Common Core State Standards, along with stronger alignment to career and workforce skills.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

8

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The LEA's form a good approach with a high quality plan that can achieve a bold and significant vision for educators based on its investment to change the educational landscape by "closing 9 schools, firing teachers, and working to develop and retain highly effective teachers by the year 2015. as referenced in the steady reform process piece.

Goals continue to be reviewed and applied for consistent measurable outcomes, and JPSS shows targets for growth, with declines in referrals, dropout rates, graduation rates, and transitions into college and career readiness modules. However, more work is needed to close existing gaps in the district-wide system, especially with Asian and Black populations. The 2 major goals construct personal learning environments for every student, along with the priority to train or hire highly effective educational leaders. This evidence by the plan's construct, "that every student have a high quality teacher by 2015".

Activities assess student learning components, such as a data tracking system, (KMS), Accelerated Lab Schools, Intensive Community Partnerships, and ongoing data initiatives. Overlapping continuous improvement activities categorize and authorize continuous improvement cycles: test best activities, and set in place superior innovations where many challenges (such as poverty) impact the learning process. Additional activities identify and align resources to personalize blending learning and flipped classroom to ALab schools. Strong school partnerships and practices set initiatives of the activities in place for mastery of academic content. Deliverables and timelines for the scaled-up initiative is timely and begins immediately with ANet rubrics in place by March, 2013, ANet partnerships in 44 schools by August, 2013, Data initiative implemented in 59 schools by August, 2014, Plan developed for implementation by July 30, 2015, along with other timelines and completions for deliverable services.

Related benchmarks and assessment tools are strong as compared to state standards; in fact the benchmarks are engines of innovations in a high poverty area and act as a bold change agent. Systemic improvements include a DATA Initiative to high schools, a focus on training school leadership teams and shows the deliverables in terms of scale up: ANET Rubric Elements by March 2013, 44 schools with ANET by August, 2013, Revised Data Best Practices by June, 2014, along with other specific target dates for implementation that seems steady and consistent with a measured growth for the plan's implementation. The process of delivery, and timetables, help distribute the implementation and incorporates the intention of the plan's vision by providing a clear and concise schedule for deliverables. The impact of expanded data to guide instruction, the use of a data system to inform best practice, the training of highly effective teachers, the crosswalks of career-ready learning, and ALab schools for improved graduation rates, are highly plausible. The expansion of staffing should decrease the drop-out rate, and the use of blended or flipped classrooms is achievable and flexible in a way to serve student's personal learning environments along with supporting it with qualitative and quantitative data as a superior way to inform the process. Tools of support seem reliable KMS, RTI processes will revamp and provide powerful instructional tools.

The LEA's approach to implement ICP schools limit the implementation of the ICP model to middle schools. It did invite those schools able to obtain the 70% of signatures needed and part of the plan provides that schools fall into rank order, in essence

graded. The key objective of the plan is sheperding students through schools on grade level and on time. A key outcome of the plan is a "best practice" guide that all teachers will create and own. A data plan is ambitious and would match students to teacher, and a project director and other human capital lays the framework and foundation for future success. Strategis around Compass performance management and specific deliverables and timelines seemed appropriate for innovations that deliver on timeframes and offer a deliverable schedule for the scaled-up best practices of lab schools. Teachers, principals, students, and the newly organized Central office bear the roles and responsibilities of providing deliverables on time. The overall plan is credible given the powerful tools that support the approach and implementation (a blueprint) of monitored interventions, on-track indicators, and scaled achievement systems.

Student performance improvements of the district fall short of the overall (4) year of quality application benchmark. still the district-wide goals to reform the school are steady and quantitative, but based in part on future systems. This is a mid-level high quality plan as it does not achieve the (4) year benchmark of on-going, documented success in the classroom setting, there is a lack of evidence to align with high quality teachers and leaders at this phase in the school reform process. Data systems are not ready for implementation, and there is still further climate change needed to turn-around drop-out, graduation, and retention rates. While some postsecondary alignment is on track for those who do graduate, it has not arrived yet in terms of deliverables.

None the less, the overall credibility of the plan is sufficient and effective given the timeline, framework, key goals, strategies, and those (adminstrators and teachers) who are given oversight of district-wide wide benchmark reforms; this district-wide intervention combined with superior data analysis through KMS, shows considerable potential for scaling the Lab school and other components into far reaching change including the potential to further graduation rates, and career to postsecondary school readiness.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	7
---	----	---

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant's vision will change the student learning and performance over time, there is not enough benchmarking to prove performance over a four year time period. However, the 18 month turnaround proves tha the JPPSS system in on the correct course of highly remarkable school reform. The data shows:

(a) Accelerated progress of students who are already high-achieving students, bringing 95% of students to proficiency in math and Language Arts.

The average growth rate in math and ELA are higher in all grades but 6th grade. There are significant gains across students who enroll in postsecondary education, a strong showing of 42.2 percent. Over time the percentage points of increase are significant in both math and Language Arts.

(b) In lowering achievement gaps and improvement of student scores content specialists have been called upon to assist principals with priorities of tasks.

The levels of proficiency ouline lack sufficient documentation for analysis around the areas of targeted learning and performance and increased equity for all students that meet or exceed target established for all LEA's.

Graduation rates show moderate growth with a projection of 3% growth in by 2015-2016. Negative gaps were recorded for the Compass Comparison Score group. Negative score gaps with Asian students on the Compass Score Group at JPPSS. College enrollment increases improved slightly about 1%.

Graduation rates should rise by 3%. In 2011, 68% of JPPSS schools were rated D or F, but starting in the 2012-2013 school year, teachers and principals will be measured with 50 percent evaluation based on student growth and 505 based on performance against Danielson Framework for Teaching. Performance based compensation will ensure higher graduation rates, and more transitions into postsecondary, strongly supported through exisiting partnerships and the promise of new ones.

Graduation increases are moderate over time, about 1%, moreover, the number of students in sub-group on track to college and career-readiness as defined meets the application rate in grades 4-8, with scores of basic or above expects modest gains in 2012-2013. High reaching and rapid increase is sufficient to meet transitions to high school and college career readiness, with the goal of 95% of 8th grades on time and on track to graduate career and college ready. JPPS expects modest gains with case managed students, who are in subgroups based on the district's reform policies and procedures. Strong academic achievement is expected for those who struggle the most, there are some sections of the plan that lack descriptive elements, timeline, and framework information on the KMS data system. More information could have been forthcoming on how the data information would inform the process of the plan implementation. College and graduation information not as strong to address gaps needed for quick sturdy turn-around.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The high quality plan records rapid response and immediate action on changing the learning environment. The approach to the plan shows ambitious key strategies and a steel will to change learning outcomes and close achievement gaps through demands that measure and reward teacher effectiveness. Proof of this is demonstrated by school closures, staff firings, and the transfers of students into higher achieving schools, even to the disruption of the family. Bold, measures, and reliance on grants to turn-around low achiever schools is impacting the classroom by, increasing and closing gaps in ELA and Math, increasing graduation rates, (slightly), and placing emphasis on College and Career-Ready goal alignments, that can be tracked to specific timelines for delivery. The scaffolding approach is ambitious to raise student achievement through careful monitoring of raw student data, along with support methods for students to view and track this data. Improved measures are expected to be achieved in all subgroups,</p> <p>The data does not show past 4 years of success, although it does outline change measures for the school-wide system. This is evidence by school closures, transfers of students to more successful schools, high quality of teaching strategies, and the focus on individual student outcomes for learning. "JPPSS struggles to realize the vision for all students, and lacks necessary resources to catch-up." Achievement gaps were addressed in areas of math and English, with significant ground to cover, along with graduation rates. To the point, it does lack success at this time based on insufficient graduation rates, transitions to postsecondary education, and low achievement score ranges. ELA percent proficient Multi-year Subpopulations report shows modest ELA gains, except for Asians and Blacks. A slight increase for grade 7 in ELA and Math proficiencies. Overall, the high quality plan offers specific activities to promote and measure success such as the KMS, PARCC assessment, building student measurements for growth and success, and real-time feedback to teachers and principals to implement personal learning environments with moderate graduation increment improvements and a small percentage enrolled into college.</p> <p>(b) The demonstration of a clear track record is proven for closing poor and failing schools, and removing ineffective teachers and principals. There is a strong indication that the JPPSS system is headed in the right direction but student learning outcomes lag with "36% of students who arrive at the 9th grade level on time and on level." Additionally, "a quarter of the students are retained at least once." Achievement gaps continue to be addressed but a data system is needed to inform the process of just where the gaps exist for a more precise student awareness in knowing where to focus and improve strategies for targeted learning. The plan builds out the vision by adopting state standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace, (demonstrated by The Achievement Network.) Building robust data systems that measure student growth and retention, a new knowledge management system to promote mastery of subject materials for Common Core Standards.</p> <p>The largest percentage of growth is with ELA 66% with 8th graders, along with significant math growth of about 5% over 4 years.</p> <p>Negative gaps on referrals, moderate growth is projected on future instruction, and services. Moderate transitions into college at about 1%.</p> <p>Achievement of ambitious and significant reforms are not manifested in persistently low-achieving schools yet.</p> <p>Data reforms will start to build a management system, but teachers will need to be trained as will principals. RTTD plan is significant, but teachers in the district as stated in the plan will need to make significant improvements and may need additional training to perform best practice for differentiated instruction for ANET with embedded routines, teacher best practices lack momentum at this time.</p> <p>(c) No data system as defined in notice is available yet to students or educators as a way to inform or improve best practices for instruction and/or services, or to inform or improve participation of students in their own learning or to inform parents of where students can improve instruction or remove barriers to learning. However, the plan justifies an over-all mid-high range based on its attention to meaningful school reform. The KMS once implemented signifies a significant change in the educational landscape and will support the benchmarking of student success, given it is real-time, quality, feedback that is used to inform and improve instructional systems and outcomes of learning.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Actual goals include more transparency in the LEA as demonstrated by the step in ensuring that district resources "are</p>		

equitibly distributed for the overall benefit of the student." JPPSS participates as one of 7 schools in the statewide Louisiana Student-Based Budgeting pilot-program.

Building trust among collaborative entities is vital to ensure that all students are represented and based on the needs of students. The LEA strives to overcome any inequitable failings in terms of funding based formulas. The re-tooling of the LEA 's budget for enhanced student/pupil support is best done by formulas that govern resources and allocations based on a school-wide district partnership that uses data to inform best practice. The implementation of a budget book that details the total amount of expenditures for each school justified and supports the idea that parent have ready access to all financial information. Information is communicated to the public annually, and that is a promising practice.

(A) actual personel salaries broken down into categories, good for tracking instructional and non-instructional cost, LA in 2012 is published and tracked on Nola.com as a response to a public school record request by the newspaper, the failure to communicate personnel salaries and non-personell salaries in a drawback and lacks documentation for this application. Easy communication strategies of budget and financial school practice must be further developed to assure competency in the funding mechanisms that so impact each student and school.

(B) Actual personnel salaries at the school level is insufficient , not due to be in place until 2013-2014.

(C) No information for the personnel salaries of school teachers; only that the budget measures display how resources are aligned, this section is weak.

(D) Actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level is not streamlined into reporting practices and information is unavailable for critique.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

8

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

JPPSS shows signs of significant turn-around, and the stage is set for improvement, and the goals for autonomy are sufficient given the statewide standards promote career-college readiness, improved data collection, turnaround of persistently low-achieving schools, and the political leverages to sustain resources. Accelerated learning of statewide standards implemented in SY2012, along with (CCSS),Grade Level Standards, Crosswalks, and Math and ELA comparisons support learning environments and instructional strategies.

The past year showed student scores are improving, but not rapidly, or with superior significance. This will likely be an on-going turn-around for success. LEA's have worked to close schools and to maintain the policies and procedures to hire and fire instructors based on performance. There seems to be some autonomy within the local school district to direct it's managerial structure as evidenced by closing 9 schools, firing principals, hiring new staff members, and transferring students to other higher performing locations, The learning environment does initiative and expand upon a strong will to turn around the schools and is documented as doing it in a fairly short amount of time. Overall, the support structure including the added component of college and career ready standards along with AP dual credits supports the conditons to implement the personalized learning enviornments of the plan.

Jefferson Parris encounters obstacles in implementing personalized learning environments but with policy, restructuring of the school climate including the access to highly qualified teachers, and principals, along with a complete delivery data service to track data, key outcomes should be met and expanded upon in the future. Educational gaps are being addressed and closed in English and Math, slight increases in graduation, and increase of college and career-readiness skills.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

6

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

JPPSS offered documentation from each school with principal, parent signatures, and teacher support. Documentation provided that the union support was at 70%, with parent support groups offering advice and guidance, albeit a small sample of parents compared to the numbers of students in the district. There is cause for some concern that there should be much more parent support around the plan implementation.

The highest group of support came from teachers and administrators who signed and submitted documentation for the relevant section criterion.

Quality coherent non-profits did align with the school district to offer engagement and support for proposal which includes:

A letter from the Executive Director of Louisiana from The Achievement Network, the Tulane University School of Social Work, The Children's Health Project, and the Jefferson Parrish Human Resource Authority.

The state of Louisiana offered responses to the application in (5) areas and the Superintendent responded with information:  
 \*the state's concern was the application does not address the personalized learning in the high school sufficiently."  
 Incomplete support from the entities charged with carrying out the task of plan implementation.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

3

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The plan tries to cover all bases when describing the extent to which each LEA provided demonstrated evidence of the plan. The 1st step is descriptive of the commitment to close gaps of student learners based on high quality assessments intended for the structure of personalized learning strategies. Evidence details the hundreds of conversations within the school-system for better reform proposals and initiatives. The action plan to implement personalized learning environments and to encourage that students master the content based on student choice and teacher engagement. Inconsistency arises from the school not yet having a dependable data system to connect teacher to student in data matching for closing the skills gap. The plan lacks a sufficient outline for deliverables, and specific measurable outlines, and components. There is no data system to collect and track student performance outcomes at this time for specific targeted instruction.

The foundation while being laid, is not incorporated into the district schools in total yet.

A strong analysis of the data drove the need to design and create an innovation to "complete the picture of challenges students are facing."

Key components build into the LEA's a sense of urgency in providing program interventions to the most at-need--at-risks students. Read 180 and Fast for Word begin to address interventions for struggling students: this is evidence that software is being used to close-skill gaps with personalized learning platforms. The comparisons of teacher practice in the past to expectations for use of data, learning-styles, and interim assessments builds out the learning and is a step for improvement. The overall plan lacks on delivery of specifics such as key goals, outcomes, deliverable, integration of all areas of instruction, and is weak on theory and practice, more content and context is needed to justify the sustainability of the plan.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	15

(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

(a) i) Students evaluate their own learning climate and judge work based on profiles in learning alongside the instructor to deliver specific target-based outcomes through a variety of teaching methods and strategies. Technology provides blended and flipped classroom structures, and computer labs show a ratio of 7 students to 1 Lab instructor. Students will be connected to ANet coaching, 50 schools to have readiness training, 20 schools have better access to resources.

ii) Justified and promotes the student's own research and investment into college and career readiness modules, crosswalks between four core educational assurance areas, and district reforms, acceleration lab, and extended school day, It does not specify how students are to pursue college goals, other than complete the FASFA.

iii) Four distinct project areas are outlined for consideration and according to Section B5, most students are not receiving personalized instruction in the classroom. The KMS will address the obvious gaps and with assistance from a data monitoring tool, more performance outcomes will be achieved and that is a strong component of a high quality strategy for optimizing student learning. The KMS will specifically target and support students in creating a specific graph/chart (visual), for the enhancement of understanding and charting specific and measurable outcomes. This On-Track Indicator shows appropriate promise for focused student gains and executes a solid method of providing students and parents with much needed information for continued learning. The fact that students could set their own goals towards college is a powerful component of student ownership. 11 high poverty A Lab schools will be part of an accelerated learning model. This is a strong component of offering flexibility and should inform the process of career clusters and career-ready standards.

iv) no clear documentation on racial diversity and the access and exposures to other cultures, there is an Asian and African American Population that struggles to overcome achievement gaps.

v) A deep dive into the learning structures, but lacks sufficient information given on the models in place to provide training or mechanisms for students to manage or track their knowledge and learning. A complete list of performance measures is

offered in Appendix A, with the school corporation guarantee that 95% of students are on track by 8th grade. Common Core standards will guide the SIU team and the focus of the plan implementation is to substantially reduce student retention, discipline, and low student performance. "Output measures will be revisited and revised to provide the most actionable information." This type of information is strategically used to inform the learning process in terms of student's mastery of the content.; co-horts and study groups will enhance the framework of team concepts, creativity, problem-solving, and communication skills.

(b) i) The application lacks information on students using tools and resources provided towards graduation requirements. It does not address how elementary students would use software or learning tools in a classroom, or middle-school usage of supports towards personalized learning environments that might link to college and career self-awareness or assessments. A considerable amount of stakeholder engagement is needed to pilot various programs, and teachers and principals will need to buy-into software and be trained over time. A document timeline goal sets 100% of participating educators to log into the data tool more than once a week by the 2016 school year.

.li) A high structured approach is to use a coaching model that includes a coordinator position . As suggested in the narrative is responsible for guidance to enhanced learning, and inform the teachers and principals of how critical academic content can develop and enhance teaching/learning environments. The process of how the systems described in the plan are designed and implemented is not completely supported with concrete detail, but the use of the coordinator to complete sample schedules and serve the region is yet another tool in the toolbox for academic success.

iii) It is unclear the extend to which technology plays an integral role into the school structure to inform academic processes. Not all students have access to computers and technology as evidenced in the poverty of the district. Therefore, the plan lacks some pieces of resources to link to college and career ready proficiencies. The district did propose to give feedback to teachers through anonymous surveys that ask questions about the quality of teaching and how the KMS data system could be improved, also how teachers might utilize the tool in the classroom, but it lacked clarification in the ways the data system could be best utilized to inform that instruction in the classroom setting, or outside of the school for a more personalized learning environment. Parents did factor into the plan and that engagement is powerful for the human capital practices that make this type of collaborative effort achievable.

iv) Accommodates a high quality data system to track and linked to a teacher student match through KMS, that will target specific academic gaps for remediation, on time graduation, and to promote meeting the goal of career and college ready standards.

C. Adequate data indicates that there are mechanisms in place to provide sufficient training and supports to students, through peer mentoring, coaching, and strong classroom collaborations.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

16

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

(a) i) Most students not receiving personalized instruction, however the goal is to align Common Core Standards into the classroom by 8th grade, assuming additional supports are in place. A detailed management plan allows for instructional roles and responsibilities to provide the effective structure for students to meet individual tasks to graduation and career-ready standards.

ii) Adaptive methods include the student-lead goal sharing group as a part of the data initiative, the students executes his/her own learning plan/portfolio, and thus focused on understanding ownership of academic goals towards graduation and career-college readiness.

iii) The plan implementation requires immediacy in feedback to students in real-time to inform the process cycle of learning, this can be attained through the KMS system, text messages, social media, or other initiatives to ensure students are adequately supported throughout the entire school process to graduation and career and college readiness. Mechanisms are in place to support students with additional training and technical support. Acceleration labs, adaptive software, CCSS aligned-digital content allow students to be creative and focused on learning.

iv) Teachers and staff building blocks highlight research trends for teachers, priority of standards, identifies common misconceptions, and allows for strategic groups based on the needs and learning gaps. The teachers and principals can utilize high quality data to assess progress in all realms. A superior practice to allow teachers the flexibility to inform their own process by being able to collaborate, and owning shared language, and target professional development. The KMS documents progress based on student achievement as connected to the teacher.

(b) i) Personalized supports are in place and resonable to allow educators to increase and leverage capacities to accelerate student growth. Support is by highly developed data system to inform best practice as outlined in the vision. College and

career ready information not available here.

ii) Performance based practice and compensation for teacher and principal improvement in place as a way to encourage and increase better outcomes for the school environments most difficult to impact.

c) High quality implementation across four cross organizations, responsibilities include half-day professional development, conversations with grade-level educators where instructors will case manage students by identifying specific standards, sub-standards, and overall skills that need to be addressed.

i) Strong regular data-driven feedback to be used to complete action plans that modify and assess best practices. Evidence research based theory connects to the multi-leveled approaches to best implement personalized learning, along with shared instructional strategies among grade levels and teams to promote quality assurance standard, and critique effectiveness.

ii) As stated above training system revolve around half-day professional development blocks, and supplemental data meetings to adapt instructional best learning practices and to re-assess any learning gaps. Useful reflection of impact of educational strategies upon student mastery, as demonstrated by regular team meetings and putting a high quality instructor in every classroom.

#### D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	12

##### (D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

a) Evaluative measures are not impossible, but having units controlled by different units created barriers that the new plan implementation focus is to deride specifically through a SIU, Strategic Initiatives Unit. This component bears the responsibility of filtering through the managerial reorganization, the management of district data, and aligning for growth the policies and procedures for overall project management. The Chief Financial Officer provides that all innovations are implemented through resources and tools that lead building stronger infrastructure, yet with a system in place to have overriding control of flexible spending to ensure individual student success.

(b) Strong based components for flexibility in scheduling and use of calendars for strategic overall improvement. Calendars and other autonomy may lead to dual credit components, field trips, and other types of multiple based platforms for student success. School leadership teams will create a policy sufficient for progressing the initiative. One strength is the acceleration and mastery of multiple units as reference in the SIU in charge of creating solutions for the ALab schools. It is not clear how this process will unfold, but the leadership teams do have an abundance of research to combine in a flipped or blended technology classroom.

(c) Louisiana schools are taking school systems "beyond the brick and mortar of the school building allowing sufficient options through accelerated learning systems. An organizational graph and chart, explains the variable factors for school success, there is no specific percentages in this section, or specific colleges or credits identified to inform the process. However there is much evidence to suggest that the opportunity given blended-learning and distance learning, along with flipped classrooms will increase and benefit accelerated learning outcomes in a personalized learning environment.

(d) Students are given the autonomy to use various resources; albeit limited resources to engage in the classroom. The technology is slowly starting to appear so that students are able to use distance learning to access anytime, anywhere contextualized learning. The strategies surrounding the use of more technology will enhance the outcomes for learning. There is a strong model for crosswalks and that along with the PARCC consortium will allow the achievement network to measure dependable student outcomes. All teachers are starting to align lesson plans to testing strategies for improved student mastery of each common core linked standard, the process is not perfect yet, but it is improving according to the context and documentation. Students are able to readdress standards through debate, case studies, cohort groups, media, social networking, flipped classrooms, and blended technology all aligned to the Common Core Standards and ALB.

(e) Instructional changes are impacted by far-reaching changes into capital management, this board policy, and limits the scope of instructional practices resulting in the release of nearly a quarter of JPPSS principals, in this shaking of the structure is strong reform, principals are required to hit growth targets along with an accountability program, it is vital, as this is what truly impacts learning resources and instructional practices. A data-driven culture is now in place and learning resources are starting to shape the educational landscape. Students have access to an Achievement Network Model, Acceleration Lab, and a crosswalk between (4) educational assurance areas; quality personalized learning environments, high quality teachers,



funding to sustain the program, and a sufficient data-match program. Building the data systems do lead to overall growth and success over time, but this LEA doesn't have it in place yet. There is adequate address for ELS students to share common language, but lacks sufficient specific activities. Disability is not readily addressed in the plan and could have further supports built into the plan for those special need cases.

This is a high quality plan based on the over-riding theme to create personal learning environments and to provide the stakeholders the vision, resources, structure, design, human capacity, and technology to implement it according the the principals and options to accelerate learning and impact the school culture and climate. The organizational structure is the foundation that executes the high quality plan as a way to form paragidm shifts away from the status quo for deeper more personalized learning outcomes. The commitment to assure that each child has a high quality, highly professional teacher in every classroom is a recommendation supported by all Common Core Standards, and has far-reaching implications to be an agent for change in areas that are in most need of change.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)

10

7

(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The plan is a high quality plan as evidenced by the criterion referenced through innovative, and specific goals to implement personal learning environments to allow students the flexibility to own their own education and to be responsible for their own learning; although the plan supports the student through the use of highly effective and motivated educational leaders, as evidenced by the firing of those who did not perform. The timeframe serves to provide that the increments are consistently and appropriately applied to the learning task at hand. Academic supports are placed close to the schools, teachers and principals have autonomy over school scheduling and calendars, allowing all students, regardless of income, a high quality level of instruction. This is best evidenced by the use of feeder schools and feeder patterns.

The KMS system will leverage various data systems to interface with the cloud and has a formidable structure in place to allow for students to import to an open format for bringing the classroom into anytime, anywhere learning. The portal is user friendly, according to the plan, although the evaluation is vague on how the parents and students will be allowed to interface, One strong point is that there seems to be a text alert system as a communication tool.

The KMS rollout and utilization allows for great support structures such as train-the-trainer, self-help, and tutorial implementation. A vendor will have to be secured in order for the knowledge management system to create and rely on sustainability. That component is one unknown in the plan's structure, but it is assumed the vendor, as stated, "would bring a reliable successful track record" to the district. The use of an executive director of technology would be an essential component of the plan. The leadership is set to drive the and guide the deployment of resources, and that is a sufficient model, within the structure of the plan. The specific, measurable outcomes of performance measures, would reside heavily with a high quality supportive technology manager. In additon, justification for this piece of the plan comes from " eight technology and technical support team members to meet the rationof 1:250, but that student to trainer ratio seems a bit high for true impactive effectiveness.

Overarching cloud based data tool, that would ensure all students, parents, and stakeholders would have online tools available for ready assistance, but the vendor may have to play a supportive role, and that support and structure is not clear in this particular paragraph. Each school is supported by a NED, Network Executive Director, alongside a SE3's (School Support Specialist). Polcies implement the autonomy for peer-support, online support, and local supportive networks.

A specific and measurable set of software can lead, guide, and direct in this plan for maximized learning impacts. This is evidenced by the students in ALab, KMs, and Data Initiatives, whereby parents and students can access information 24/7 . A vital piece of the learning supports, as indicated in the plan, is a 24 hour tech-support person. This equals having dedicated support technicians to answer calls to make sure the software is functional.

High quality school leaders and teachers, coupled with teacher effectiveness is a broad component but comes with specific degrees of evaluative components; what was offered to remediate or train ineffective instructors, what values were place or references as ineffective instructors? Did the teacher lack sufficient resources to be effective in the classroom environment? What role did the school climate and structure play in the determination of a high quality leader. The plan fails to answer these types of important questions that often lead to the necessary research needed to understand the cycle of the system and systemic problems. Discipline referrals, absenteeism, and retention seems to be factors that do impact the overall effectiveness of the classroom and individualized instruction, a student cannot learn if he/she does not show up for class.

The encouragement of parents and students to access mobile phones, computers, and other tools, has some unique characteristics; it is valuable to have this link to inviatiions, announcements, newsletters, where parents and students are informed of school and district-wide events. This type of communication is worthy of promoting timely information in a portable, anytime, anywhere, accessible manner. The functionality is practical and engages the plan ensuring LEA's and schools use all types of information to inform and build process support for better learning and achievement performance measures.

Lea's do not interface with interoperable data systems at this time. However, it is proposed that there is a direct element of user supports through direct messaging, graphic packets, KMS, where parents and students can access information on the go, and at home. Regular printed materials to be sent home to parents to deepen and expand on the communication process. Encouragement of parents to have access to these tools is achievable.

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	7
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>It is understandable that the approach may seem that rigorous continuous improvement is still able to occur at the elementary and middle-school level. However, there appears to be an underlying assumption that it is too late to "turn-around" the high schools due to absenteeism and school referrals. There is a need for additional information to comply with a systemic system of measurement around the tasks for the plan implementation. A procedure for monitoring the measurement of the continued process of improvement is lacking in specific details and deliverables,</p> <p>A high quality plan for the best thinking at this time would include a clear-cut approach for improving student graduation rates, and alignment for successful transitions into postsecondary education. The vision and goals of this application therefore is only half of the opportunities that should be offered throughout the district. For this reason continuous improvement is limited in its approach and scope of outreach for all student in the district.</p> <p>The equity for all students in this instance is limited and incompatible to the core of Race to the Top and therefore the quality of the vision is not reflected for the term of this particular grant. The strategy for a continuous improvement process does not address the high schools, school to work, or career-readiness strategies, and this is a key component of the grant.</p> <p>There is no data system yet to track student performance outcomes that would measure success or inform specific target areas for growth.</p> <p>Teacher and principal improvement plans, while discussed, has no real support or information surrounding strong professional development, other than on training for a data system that is not in place yet.</p>		
(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	2
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Strong evidence supports a clear pathway to offer autonomy to instructors and academic leaders through local resource tools such as ANet, ALab and KMS, these interfaces tools will allow for the flexibility needed to inform and instruct the learning along with communication in real-time, and in immediate detail to inform the mastery of ongoing performance outcome based learning.</p> <p>Stakeholders have a variety of options to inform the overall process of ongoing future success, in terms of communication by team meetings, data collection and analysis, professional development, and the conditions in place for reorganization. These items are available with differentiated methods such as newsletters, text messages, etc.</p> <p>The fact that stakeholders will have input into the plan is somewhat justified, but no specifics are put in place to the "how" this process unfolds. Key stakeholders appear to be invited to join the conversation on measures presented, but no measures are presented in the plan in specific, and identified ways. Thus, it is a vague in the types of interface systems, technology, and how that system/structure would be used to benefit all stakeholders in a solid form of communication and engagement. Therefore, a lower scaled-score in this specific category, but much potential for growing it out where the district needs to improve student achievement.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	4

(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:

a. Focus is based on 8th grade learners, for the most part, a measurable goal is that JPPSS would ensure that 95% of students are on track in the 8th grade. The section asking about highly qualified principals and teachers does not merit the backing of data to ensure such quality and standards at this juncture in time. It is more going from point A to point B in establishing of the actual criteria for higher performance from teachers and students at this time. It is significant to note that the plan does project a certain number of highly trained teachers and principals at some future date, but only after significant interventions and trainings. It seems the elementary schools are the ones that lack sufficient teacher quality.

A good plan is that if the input focus is not aligned with the output focus it will be revised. Sub and Co-hort groups in the middle-school range have high standards and bars to reach, although given current data, depends upon factors that by and large require large student gains for overall achievement.

To the point, while this input improvement and system design is a creative tool; measurables align to specific goals in real time with immediate feedback to inform the process are not addressed in specifics. The applicant describes teacher and principal input and feedback, but it is important to note that most systems of structure, including the data, will first need to be piloted and monitored for success.

(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
---	---	---

(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:

JPPSS outcomes are based on the technical reports in the data systems, and for this reason a sturdy linkage is evaluative based on the tool itself.

The analysis taken to improve each component is shared by a district website and stakeholder meetings judged to be a step in improving each component and measure of the approach to continuously improve upon the plan implementation. Moreover, the shared information will combine with the effective use of leveraged investments into the many ways the design is constructed as a comparison of school models.

The KMS system will produce and impact the effective use of instructor and class time, alongside information given to appraise and evaluate the mastery and knowledge of student learning.

The system will be effective as long as the stakeholders, namely parents, students, and staff utilize the system to inform best practices and in a timely manner.

One area does reference some professional development for teachers, to train teachers and principals, and to focus on connecting with students and building sound relationships for better student achievement and outcomes, still while this is a productive use of time, staff, and money; it lacks sufficient information to see where this truly benefits the working partners in decision-making structures, therefore more specific details are required.

. The score reflects the lack of details in this section to be pertinent to the evaluation of the total plan. The applicant will evaluate their proposed activities through the use of portfolio, and this is an effective measurement tool for evaluations. A data initiative for instructors shows promise for participating educators. Intensive professional development is an activity described within the plan for participating school leaders, A Lab schools along with ongoing analysis on LEAP, iLEAP, and PARCC related technology investments will allow the schools to be more productive and prescriptive within the infrastructure to implement the A Lab models beginning in 2014-2015. This is a part of their evaluative system and is adequate in measured possibilities for service delivery to school. Leaderships teams are at the center of driving and organizing management models to continuous improvement that will accelerate learning fully across the district. There will be meetings at the local level to inform the process, the principal is the key communicator, and at the local school level the plan puts in place a school coordinator to keep the plan on track and significant for attainable measures, this is workable.

ICP schools will determine the effectiveness and diagram the outcome measures for demographically similar schools, along with being responsible for the measurement on the key outcomes such as students being off-task, guiding students back on track, and be highly productive in use of promoting that all 9th grade students will graduate on-time and college and career ready, however it seems to spread the systems thin at this moment, given the schools lack of resources, The funded activities proposed are achievable and is recommended for adoption to create and build better schools within a district-wide system.

F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Knowledge Management Systems, DATA initiative, Acceleration Lab School, and Intensive Projects are the four different projects projected to gird the structure of the Budget. The primary criterion is supported throughout the narrative to obtain and assure student success. The importance of each project structures to transfer equitably amongst partnerships, and to support the four projects as outlined.</p> <p>a) it does identify the funds to be utilized to support the structure and implementation of the process. The KMS, DATA Initiative (ANet), Technology support, and personnel supports, it seems comprehensive and complete in alignment with filling overall gaps in line with the implementation of the goals and priorities of the district. Throughout the grant's cycle, some areas do increase in the budget, while other decrease, and this is sufficient evidence based information in terms of operating the plan within existing funding structures.</p> <p>b) Is reasonable and sufficient to support the plan given the strategies to rapidly turn-around the school climate and culture through innovative strategies.</p> <p>c) The plan seeks to carefully track data to inform best practices in terms of using external funding to build value into the structure of the plan that values KMS, DATA, ALab schools, and the extended day project. The projections include 4 year budgets. The one-time investments are likely software that can move the school to a model of a longer extended day of learning. This is sufficient to save money over time, and to build (if funds exist for renewal of software seats), a nice structure to build out on in the future.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	8
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The plan fields long and lasting reform and change for a personalized learning structure, along with the necessary funding in place to secure the elements of the proposal with a priority of enhancing the scaled school that sustains data systems, and innovative strategies across diverse student populations and district-wide platforms. The cost modifies the RRTD funds and allows for JPPSS to adopt a plan that sustains the major components of the timeframe and deliverables in a timely manner. The approach to the implementation through Central Office policy and school guidance manual, along with principal autonomy for flexible management (ie: decisions can be made at the local level), is significant to impact change, and for the principal to act as the change agent in the local school. Teachers and students are able to use potential resources such as KMD, ANet, and ALab to promote and achieve accelerated and personal learning environments, given that KMS is used effectively and efficiently.</p> <p>The local foundational funds and supports will increase over the time and place of the grant, 18 projected expenses in 3 years, along with additional supports in place (or potential funds) to support ALab and ICP school models.</p> <p>The district will need to look to community foundations and grants to maintain and sustain programs after the grant. The grant can provide some springboards for building a successful school entity that is not yet in place such as the KMS system, but when it is in place, sufficient funding sources appear to be in place to create and reinforce routines. The budget project outline is evident and complete.</p> <p>There is some probability of sustainability due to the Gates Foundational grant, that has lifted this district-wide school. A redesign of the salary schedules are needed for a greater impact in the sustainability of the project's goals. It is not clear how the data system might impact funding of "high performing" teachers and principals. Autonomy for schools not factored into the budget and sustainability is not clearly prescriptive in salary determinations.</p> <p>The state and local financial supports show some buy-in for turning low-achieving schools around in a timely manner, however, this district while ambitious, is not there yet in overall financial support. The Key goals are achievable including assuring that all students have a high quality teacher in each classroom by 2015. Teacher trainings through half-day professional development, along with data to inform best practice, and team approach to the appraisal of student needs is practical in its methodology. Specific and concrete details on teacher evaluative systems is not supported in the plan.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	8

# Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

A robust system is projected to equip school leaders with coaching strategies and community engagement as described in sections (A-E) and allows for needs assessment surveys to be given to parents, teachers, and students to inform the ongoing process of accelerated learning and assessments of participating students. Clear, clean, precise measures to identify partners in learning at the central office, through local school boards, and local autonomous school initiatives.

High poverty school district where 76% of students are on free and reduced lunch. Partnership goals to come alongside and provide additional health, social, and physical education for families. Better assessments for 6th grade students (6th grade scores have dropped), and one district has the highest drop-out rate in Louisiana. The strong indicators for change examine: (needs)

-Attendance and days missing not related to illness,

-Behavior

-Academics (to address failures in math and English)

-retention schedules

Illustrated and listed by schools in these partnerships there is evidence to support that the LEAs or Consortiums will build the capacity through staffing and other procedures to improve results over time.

Desired results through quarterly and ongoing inventories to assess students needs and achievement goals, stronger constructs to help bring students back to grade level, along with providing teachers and principals the tools necessary to increase the total effectiveness of interventions. A weak part of the plan is that it does not specifically address ELA or special needs in great detail.

Local and autonomous decision making structures, with a blended approach in terms of the Central Office creating policies and procedures but with the flexibility to allow principals and teachers to draw their own conclusions about how to best implement the plan for its more effective benchmarks to increase accelerated learning strategies, and support delivery reforms, timelines, frameworks, and all deliverables for personalized learning performance. This scaled approach leads to more innovative and creates designs of learning structures both at the local and district-wide levels.

Improved results are expected over time with reference to improving the graduation rate, more students college and career ready, and support to move students through on grade and on time. Combining and assessing schools by similar categories of educational attainment.

A far reaching proposal to engage parents as a partner in the success of their child's instruction, this is best evidenced by on-going surveys, parents availability to see students data, and to create interventions around non-academic supports such as health and well-being in social, physical, and emotional realms. The plan offers strengthening components to address family and school needs, but lacks strong details for special needs students.

Ongoing assessments to view the applicants progress in implementing the plan through school board and other stakeholder meetings to maximize the plan's impact or to adjust it upon reflection that will best address the ways of overcoming challenges and problems for the betterment of the school culture and climate.

Strategic and integrated approaches prevail and describe how partnerships will align for improved development of systemic organizational frameworks such as ICP, RTI, and other organizational and community measures, to cooperate in understanding of student needs and to create decision making process. KMS will group students into categories with similar background and demographics, this justified the partnerships and organizations involved to keep students progressing through to the end.

Levereraging capacities for all LEA district-wide schools reports through the KMS system, and interfaces with engaging school leaders to understand and build capacity of staff members to understand capacities includes measurables such as connecting students to the right supports from community partners.

A/BIT, and whole service schoos, site coordinators, administrators, counselors, bi-weekly meetings.

School surveys to assess ongoing needs and performance based innovations and strategies for better outcomes such as attendance, retention, graduation rates, all sound with frequent checks and balances for assessment and appraised value. Warning signs are to be referred to social, mental, and physical educational and community supports.

A superior management organization for decision-making process in terms of the central office management, alongside principals to have the autonomy needed to make their own decisions and own them, along with the team's responsibility towards teaching and engaging the learners to mastery. Evalutive systems are designed around case management systems and structures for better performance outcomes. Implementations are gathered in a reliable method and mode of monitoring through the KMS.

Engagement of parents through social media and social networking by use of ongoing surveys and portals. The quality of interventions with appropriate school teams that includes engaging parents through texts, emails, newsletters, and websites. The project director is a key component of this adjudication.

The timeline for implementation is 2013-2014, along with looking at individual goals, and performance measures, the coordinator will be in charge of tracking progress and implementation of the plan's key components. The principal will produce methods of communication to relay data to the work of community partnerships with the Network Executive director, this is a bold and high quality method of implementing the plan for maximum outgrowth and reach into the student and community populations. The director is one person (weak) in terms of having full responsibility for setting expectations and quality of services provided.

## Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

### Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

JPPSS adopts standards significant enough to meet or exceed the core educational assurances to create learning environments as supported through evident information sustained throughout the application. Continuous improvement is evidenced through analysis, planning, and implementation of continual change as demonstrated in closing of low achievement schools, and firing low-performing teachers and principals.

The performance measures align to SEA performance measures and aligns with strategic managerial frameworks for collaboration with public/private partnerships for social, emotional and mental growth, to create learning environments rich in technology and blended-learning classes, along with an innovative component of social work students as mentors. The sustainability for project goals is evidenced by autonomy for school leaders to leverage funding sources through student based budgeting and other resources. Qualitative findings address the needs and gaps for closure in the system.

Qualitative findings address overall performance indicators although Black subgroups could compare to the state trend.

Tie in to state goals for district goals, Strengthen the Compass evaluations for personalized learning environments, and ANET is potential tool to secure and support the SLT process and procedure mechanisms.

Turn-around of schools and closure shows commitment to evidence of reform, along with teachers being trained to be highly impactable in the classroom setting, The Data-Driven Teams will improve learning by linking student and teacher together for performance based outcomes, A comprehensive and cohesive vision is articulated by key components, timetable, and deliverables. There is LEA wide reform that is committed to accelerated student achievement and to deep the student's mastery of content knowledge leading to better graduation rates and the continued commitment to college and career ready standards. Compass, ANet, ALab, and KMS model components of a highly successful plan that has impact for far-reaching potential for gains.

Total	210	154
-------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0891LA-2 for Jefferson Parish Public School System

# A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	10
<p>(A)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has provided a well-developed vision represented by a crosswalk between the four core educational assurance areas and the district's reforms and vision that shows how the vision and current work build on the four core educational assurance areas. Specifically,</p> <p>Educational assurance area #1 - Adopting standard and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and compete in the global economy. The applicant has begun implementation of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and is a member through the state of Louisiana of the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessment consortium. It is noted that several schools in the district have implemented vigorous interim assessments through The Achievement Network (ANet) to regularly measure student progress. Anet is a national nonprofit that works with school leadership teams to strengthen each school's proactive use of learning standards and achievement data to rapidly increase student achievement. The applicant will build on these assessments in creating a data-driven culture at all elementary and middle schools, where all teachers plan from the CCSS and regularly assess student progress with aligned tests.</p> <p>Educational assurance area # 2 - Building data systems that measure student growth and success, and provide real-time or near real-time feedback to teachers and principals with data about the effectiveness of instruction. To achieve this reform vision area, the applicant will implement a new Knowledge Management System (KMS) for all schools that integrates multiple data systems to clearly demonstrate student mastery of each common-core-linked standard to students, parents, teachers, and principals.</p> <p>Educational Assurance Area #3 - Recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most. The applicant reports a wide host of significant changes in human resource management. Specifically, per board policy in 2012, a principal accountability program was implemented and principal effectiveness is now the guiding factor in determining which staff members must be let go when reduced budgets necessitate cutbacks. Also, starting in the 2012-13 school year, teachers and principals will be measured with 50% of the evaluation based on student growth and 50% based on performance against the Danielson Framework for Teaching. In the coming years, concurrent with the Race to the Top grant, the district will focus on recruiting and rewarding effective teachers and principals by attaching performance-based compensation to the performance evaluations. These wide-sweeping changes are designed to help all teachers and principals develop the skills needed to be highly effective in the classroom.</p> <p>Educational Assurance Area #4 - Turning around lowest-achieving schools. In 2011, 68% of district schools were rated D or F under the state's accountability system. In the same year the district was awarded School Improvement Grants to turn around four of its lowest-achieving schools. In 2012, the school board voted to close or consolidate ten low-performing and under-enrolled schools and programs. In this grant proposal, 11 of the 12 schools, where the district will offer the greatest level of support, have a "D" rating—more than a quarter of the district's remaining "D" schools. All elementary and middle schools will be transformed with a scaled-up focus on building a data-driven culture, but the lowest-achieving schools will receive the first and most intensive support for this transformation. Additionally, schools most highly impacted by poverty will receive increased supports for meeting students non-academic needs through an emphasis on existing partnerships, as well as new ones, with community based organizations and district agencies.</p> <p>The district has a compelling and transformational vision for teaching and learning - highly effective teachers personalize learning for each student by connecting the student to a seamless network of supports, both academic and non-academic, that accelerate individual progress on rigorous standards, close persistent achievement gaps, and allow every student to achieve their true potential.</p> <p>The applicant has articulated a clear and credible approach to the goals of accelerating student achievement, deepening student learning, and increasing equity through personalized student support grounded in common and individual tasks that are based on student academic interests.</p> <p>The applicant receives a high rating on this selection criterion.</p>		
(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	7
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant will use a well-planned, four-project model (further detailed in a easy to understand visual display) to implementing the reform proposal with the goal of ensuring all grades participate in various grant activities. Specifically,</p>		

(a & c) Selected schools will participate in the following tiered projects: (1) The Knowledge Management System (KMS) will be the broadest intervention, reaching all district stakeholders, including parents and community members. KMS will track the data and growth measures for every district student. (2) With the DATA Initiative, the district will expand the partnership with ANet to nearly all elementary and middle schools. Fifty-nine of 65 district elementary and middle schools (90.8%) and two district-authorized charter schools, with at least 70% of teacher support, have asked to participate in the DATA Initiative with documented letters of support. All elementary and middle schools willing to participate in the DATA Initiative will implement ANet's CCSS-aligned interim assessments in the first year of the proposal. The applicant reports that in the first year, the DATA Initiative will reach approximately 22,971 students. (3) In the Acceleration Lab Schools (ALab), the school schedule will be adapted and/or extended for a personalized day. ALab Schools also call for changes in instructional practice, and use of data and technology. Schools were selected based on past performance and current school and leadership climate. Eleven elementary and middle schools obtained signatures from more than 70% of teachers allowing them to participate as an ALab school. (4) Intensive Community Partnership Schools. The implementation of the ICP model pilot was limited to middle schools, which currently struggle to promote students to high school on time and prepared for rigorous college- and career-preparatory courses. Six schools were selected with signatures from more than 70% of teachers supporting the initiative. Altogether, the applicant reports that schools implementing the DATA Initiative, ALab, or Intensive Community Partnerships will have approximately 22,971 participating students in the first year, and 31,772 students by the fourth year of the grant.

(b) A list of the schools that will participate in grant activities is provided.

Although the applicant provided substantial details on their plan for implementation, they did not include in the description some of the components of a high-quality plan, including key goals, activities and rationale, and timeline over four-year grant cycle.

The applicant receives a high mid-range rating for a description of their four-project participation model.

(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)

10

7

(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provides a partial high-quality plan for their reform and change efforts. The plan includes the deliverables, the time completed, and the person responsible. The plan is lacking the key goals, activities and rationale, and timeline over four years, as required in this selection criterion. The plan is considerable in scope and depth of practice, focuses on providing extensive data to personalize teaching and learning which is the leading premise in the applicant's theory of change.

The DATA initiative is an impressive district-wide teaching effort that empowers teams of teachers and school leaders to reflect on data from interim assessments to adapt instruction. The Initiative will build on an existing partnership between the district and ANet. The use of ANet's CCSS-aligned assessments has a record of success in the district's lowest performing schools, which have been using ANet services since SY 2011-12. The applicant notes that the gains made in these schools place them among the most improved across the state. The applicant will use ANet in 59 of the 65 elementary and middle schools in the district, as well as two additional charter schools in the district.

The DATA Initiative will then be scaled up to high schools using a successful coaching model similar to the coaching delivered under the ANet model to the elementary and middle schools. A DATA Leadership Specialist will be selected to coordinate, monitor, and support fidelity of implementation, as well as increase the data capacity of other support staff. A key outcome of this effort will be the creation of a best practices guide that will be applicable to all district schools, including high schools that do not directly partner with ANet, so that all teachers in the district will learn of this process. The best practices guide will be revised each year based on implementation results. The district also plans to use the Compass performance management system to align feedback to teachers and principals with the best practices identified by ANet. The project director is responsible for the on-time completion of all deliverables.

The applicant receives a high mid-range score for their plan which was lacking descriptions of some of the elements of a high-quality plan (key goals, activities, deliverables, timelines, and persons responsible), a requirement of this selection criterion.

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)

10

10

(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:

In setting district-wide goals for reform, the applicant focused on a solid approach to accelerating the progress of students who are already achieving at high levels, while closing achievement gaps for students who are behind their peers, through the grant activities of this proposal. The tables provided by the applicant show annual performance targets for all students to reach district goals (95%) by school year (SY) 2016-17. For example, 95% of students will rise to the proficiency level from the baseline of 49% on math and ELA assessments in grades 4-8, increasing the graduation rate from baseline 67.3% to 95%,



and increasing the postsecondary enrollment rate from baseline 67.8% to 95%. These levels of proficiency, graduation, and college enrollment represent an ambitious improvement in student achievement across the district and exceed the state targets for the district. By personalizing learning for every student through the use of data to improve instruction, as well as scaling up targeted learning interventions from ALab and ICP schools, these targets are considered achievable for every group of students. The applicant projects that, over this grant period, grant activities will reverse the district's achievement gaps by SY 2016-17. This is a substantial but feasible goal and visionary target.

The applicant receives a high rating for this selection criterion.

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	15

### (B)(1) Reviewer Comments:

1. The applicant as established a clear record of success in advancing student learning and increasing equity in learning and teaching. (a) For example, the applicant notes that over the last four years, percentages of district students scoring above "Basic" on both the English language arts (ELA) and mathematics portions of the Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) and Integrated Louisiana Education Assessment Program (iLEAP) exams have increased at a faster rate than the state average for Louisiana in every grade. Notably, much of the growth in proficiency on these tests is seen by above-average increases for minority students. African American students had the highest cumulative proficiency gains of any subgroup on nine of twelve LEAP and ILeap assessments between 2008 and 2012. Over the same period, the percentage of Hispanic/Latino students scoring proficient or above also increased dramatically. In addition, over the last 4 years the district has narrowed the gap between its district and the state average from 11.8 points to less than four points receiving a designation as a "Top Gains" school. The applicant also reports that as student achievement has improved since 2008, the cohort graduation rate in the district has also increased. The cohort graduation rate in the district rose 6.6 percentage points since 2006-07, while the state's cohort graduation rate increased only 4.6 percentage points over the same period, gains that closed one third of the initial gap between the district and the state. It is also worthy to note that the number of district high school graduates who enrolled in a postsecondary institution climbed from 42.6% of the graduating class of 2007 to 44.0% of the class of 2011.

(b) The applicant aptly emphasizes that a key part of the district's vision and reorganization of the central office structure was based in the effort to turn around the district's lowest-performing schools. The district was reorganized to provide more targeted support to schools by placing them into an innovative network (partner) model. Schools were grouped together in networks with common needs or feeder patterns and each network is overseen by a Network Executive Director (NED). Each NED is responsible for ensuring every school in his or her network receives high-quality support from the district office and is also the evaluator for each principal in the network. As part of this process, specialized expertise and resources are provided to a small number of schools designated for turnaround. It is worthy to note that the Turnaround Network is run by a former principal with experience in improving student achievement and that targeted support is provided by a team of School Support Specialists who bring content, special populations, and programs expertise. Also, it is notable that the district has intensified its current ANet services to the lowest-performing schools (including all the schools in the Turnaround Network). Currently, nine schools are a part of the Turnaround Network. All nine are implementing the most intense of the federal intervention models, the "turnaround model." The turnaround model required that the schools replace the principal and at least 50 percent of the staff. It also required the turnaround schools to lengthen their school day and year. In concert, the district has also worked to improve its lowest-performing schools by increasing school-based autonomy, raising accountability standards, and closing or consolidating persistently lowest-achieving schools. The closure and consolidation decisions were made with careful deliberation to ensure that all students were reassigned to higher achieving schools. Additionally, based on a failure to meet multi-year student performance targets, at the end of the 2011-12 school year, the district removed 22 principals. These challenging and expansive efforts, combined with overall district improvement, have led to 16,000 students attending higher-performing schools in 2012-13 than in 2011-12.

(c) To date, the district has made schools' accountability scores available to parents and the community through many avenues including posting them in the local newspaper, on each school's website, and in each school's parent newsletter, giving parents the option to move their children to another district school if their assigned school was performing poorly and/or to discuss this information with the district. It is reported that data from student report cards, as well as LEAP and iLEAP tests, has also been available to students and parents both electronically and by printed report cards, and to teachers to use in planning for the year. In 2012-13, teachers are required to set Student Learning Targets (SLTs) based on these student LEAP proficiency scores, and use student performance on LEAP tests and course assignments, to improve instruction. In addition, the applicant reports that teachers also use student performance data from interim assessments, including those provided by ANet, to improve and adapt their instruction.

The applicant show a substantial record of previous success in communicating with parents and community and receives a high rating on this selection criteria.

(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)

5

2

(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:

Although the applicant cites various examples of improvement in educational transparency in processes and practices, the applicant has not made available school level expenditures from State and local funds in actual personnel salaries for all school-level instructional and support staff; actual personnel salaries at the school level for instructional staff only; actual personnel salaries at the school level for teachers only; and actual non-personnel expenditures at the school level as described in sub-criteria A-D. However, the applicant does note that the anticipated move to student-based budgeting will initiate increased transparency, and all personnel and non-personnel costs will be available at the school level beginning in 2013-2014.

The applicant receives a lowr mid-range rating on the selection criterion.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

10

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant aptly described several state initiatives that offer flexibility for local autonomy that would allow LEAs to develop workable personalized learning environments in their own unique settings. For example, the applicant cited the state has created and streamlined processes for districts to apply for a waiver from state requirements on seat time and class size. This waiver allows districts to adopt alternative methods for students to master coursework requirements, such as through a condensed accelerated curriculum or personalized curriculum, depending on the needs of students in the district. A district may also apply for a class size waiver by submitting a request to the state with strong justification for the proposed class size adjustments. The applicant notes that the waivers allow the district to offer students options for accelerated credit attainment, to extend the reach of highly effective teachers, and to create Acceleration Labs with sixty students in designated ALab schools. Also, it is reported that the state has greatly increased the number of AP courses offered both in traditional settings and through the Louisiana Virtual School, and smoothed the process for easy and accessible dual enrollment across the state.

Such flexibility for local autonomy places this applicant in the high range in this criterion.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

10

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

(a) The applicant has demonstrated meaningful stakeholder engagement in the development of the proposal including input from students, parents, teachers, and principals. For example, several of these meetings or conversations resulted in improvements to the proposal such as access to a real-time, easy-to-use data dashboard that could be used to identify needs and personalize instruction for students, resulting in the idea for the Knowledge Management System (KMS). In addition, the expansion of ANet services through the DATA Initiative was derived from these conversations. Additional input was solicited from from parents and students through four parent organization meetings during the month of September as the RTT-D plan was being developed. At each meeting, the draft plan was presented to a group of 11-20 parents and students and feedback was collected. The applicant noted four key themes repeatedly emerged from these conversations that were incorporated into planning for the proposal.

(ii) The applicant does not use collective bargaining. They report and provide documentation that 59 of 65 of eligible schools submitted letters of support with signatures from at least 70 percent of teachers.

(b) The applicant also shows strong support from other external stakeholders, including local businesses, community service providers, and political representatives engaged in the development of the plan. Letters of support from key stakeholders were included in the appendix.

These findings support a high rating on this selection criterion.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant designed an assessment process and assessment tool, not a high-quality plan (key goals, activities, deliverables, timelines, and persons responsible) as defined by the requirements for this selection criterion. The applicant has expressed the need for improving student performance and has developed their process and proposal around the logic that transforming teaching at the school level is needed for systemic change to improve student learning. The applicant described the process which they used to obtain feedback from district staff and stakeholders to develop an understanding of the district's strengths, needs, and gaps with regard to implementing a personalized learning model, so that the district's plan could address these gaps. It is apparent that the assessment was wide-based in scope, as the applicant reports that the assessment was carried out through conversations with hundreds of district staff, principals, parents, students, and community stakeholders, as well as through a thorough analysis of district data. The results of the analysis made clear that current reforms have yet to improve access to data (the district lacks a uniform method of gathering data), change teacher practice (the district does not have standardized the interim assessments used across elementary and middle school classes or professional development to understand how to use all of their assessment information). In addition, the current practice lacks student personalization of learning. For example, the students do not currently have the ability to set their own academic goals and pace or participate in deep learning experiences in their areas of interest. The applicant reports an inconsistent academic intervention system and the lack of high-quality community supports to meet emotional, social, and physical health needs of students.

In terms of academic gaps, the district is still behind the state scores in students arriving at 4th grade on time and on-level (53.7% state, 49.9% district), students receive a 20 on ACT by 11th grade (48.0% state, 39.6% district) and cohort graduation rate (71.4% state, 67.3% district). The district has developed their four-project school-level model - Knowledge Management System, DATA Initiative, ALab Schools, and ICP Schools - around the gaps and needs from their needs assessment.

The applicant used extensive efforts to gather the information on district needs and gaps and embedded their proposal plans around the logic that transforming teaching at the school level is needed for systemic change to improve student learning. However, because the applicant did not provide evidence (key goals, activities and rationale, timeline, deliverables, parties responsible) of the manner in which they conducted the need assessment, the applicant receives a low mid-range rating on this selection criterion.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	13

### (C)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant has developed a proposal that has, at its core, the principles of personalized learning enabling each student to drive their own learning plan, based on their own academic interests, through their four-project plan. This will occur through the participation in a rigorous course of study aligned to college- and career-ready standards and college- and career-ready graduation requirements. Avenues and supports are also available to accelerate the students' learning.

(a)(i -ii)(c) The applicant has developed a comprehensive plan for scaling access to grant activities over the four years of the grant. Key to the reform is the students' ability to participate with fidelity in the development of their own learning plan. To help student understand that what they are learning is key to their success, the applicant has developed an innovative on-track indicator through the KMS initiative for all students and parents where they will be able to see a visual depiction of the student's path towards college- and career readiness. This on-track indicator will be regularly updated with student progress on interim assessments, formative assessments, attendance, and behavior. This feature will help provide students with an understanding and ownership of their academic status. In addition, for the elementary and middle schools that are part of the DATA Initiative, teachers and parents would help each student set goals around their achievement in English language arts (ELA) and math on interim assessments. Student progress would be visually charted in KMS, indicating how close they are to their goals as well as providing them with information about their progress towards the overall goal of either passing eighth grade state assessments or a closer benchmark that would be predictive of the eighth grade goal. Personalized learning recommendations for which standards next address would be clearly displayed. Additionally, students and parents could opt to receive regular updates on their goals by e-mail or text message. Teachers would receive training as part of the DATA initiative to ensure they could support students appropriately in this process.

(iii-v) The applicant reports that for the 11 elementary and middle schools that are in in the ALab pilot, implementing personalized learning recommendations will enable each student to explore areas of academic interest aligned with the CCSS. For some students this may mean taking high-school level courses before they leave 8th grade. For example, if a student has demonstrated clear mastery of seventh grade math during their lab time, they would be able to progress to a virtual course in

Algebra I to be completed during their ALab time as well as during existing class time. Elements of the programs, especially for advanced students, will provide students with increased exposure to deep learning experiences that include diverse cultures, contexts, and perspectives.

(b) (i-iii) For schools in ALab, the self-paced, CCSS-aligned digital content will test students to allow them to set their own goals and move to the next module or standard, creating a sequence personalized to the standards recommended for, and mastered by, each student. (v)(A-B) The data created by these frequent assessments can be checked daily by math and ELA teachers and used to design lesson plans for each class, allowing them to re-teach standards that are challenging for the class or to focus on creativity, critical thinking, and problem-solving skills during traditional class time. (v) The applicant reports that to best serve struggling students, ALab schools will use both their most effective teachers and the additional support of the adaptive software to provide targeted support to small groups of high-need students.

(c) The applicant also reports that school-based staff will be intensively trained to support students on how to use the KMS and ALab software to track and manage their learning.

The applicant has presented a well-designed, comprehensive plan for ensuring personalized learning of college- and career-ready standards, geared to student academic interests. Although the applicant shares much descriptive information and impressive planning, the response does not include all the elements of a high quality plan. Specifically the applicant does not link the goal and activity rationale to the deliverables/activities and responsible parties mentioned in the application. In addition a distinct timeline of events over the four years of the grant is lacking. The applicant receives a high mid-range rating on this selection criteria.

(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)

20

14

(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant describes an approach to teaching and leading that helps educators to improve instruction and increase their capacity to support student progress. The applicant has developed a comprehensive method to ensure that educators are effective, and describes professional development, an educator evaluation system, and data support to ensure that occurs. Central to this effort is the foundational understanding of the data that needs to drive instruction. The applicant has built the foundation for this through their Knowledge Management System that supports all schools and students by providing timely, up-to-date data on student learning progress. Through professional development to be provided to understand this system, teachers will be able to use their new understanding of the students' needs to plan group lessons and personalized instructional approaches, making it possible to match high-quality resources to each student's needs.

(a)(i-iii) The applicant describes a wide-range, three-prong strategy to be used to train educators on how to use the foundational data system, KMS. In addition, as part of the DATA Initiative, the applicant will partner with ANet to provide professional development to help educators understand how to use ANet to administer CCSS-aligned interim assessments. Specifically, the teachers will be placed in grade- and subject-centered data analysis teams that, initially with the coaching and support of ANet, use this data to analyze student understanding, adapt content and instruction, and improve their practice. To create a culture of personalized learning across the entire school system, the applicant plans for ANet to be expanded from the current 24 schools to reach nearly all elementary and middle schools (59 of 65 schools in the district, plus two charter schools who agreed to participate in this grant initiative). Professional development will be graduated, initially focusing on the schools with the greatest academic needs. As the data is funneled from ANet into KMS, trends for teachers and prioritized standards for focus will be provided. In addition, KMS can identify common misconceptions among their students, and suggest grouping based on student needs.

(a)(iv) (iv) The applicant notes that they are currently implementing a new performance-based principal and teacher evaluation system, Compass, which has already increased the accountability among staff for increasing student achievement. Under the evaluation system, the district has mandated ambitious student growth targets for teachers to meet to be evaluated as highly effective. Compass mandates that 50% of teachers' evaluation score be based on student achievement. The remaining 50% of the evaluation is based on multiple observations, which act as a key driver of feedback and teacher improvement. Also, the applicant is in the process of designing a performance-based compensation system that will help define the teacher and principal workforce of the future. The district currently envisions a system that will increase compensation for the best teachers and principals in the district. In order to be identified as high performing, educators must demonstrate their ability to personalize instruction, prepare students for college and career, and provide leadership to move their school forward. It is believed that this system will set the expectation that with higher pay comes increased responsibility – highly effective teachers must expand their reach to a greater number of high-need students and those who need effective instruction the most.

(b)(i-ii) KMS will link to a variety of resources, instructional content, and tools to help teachers and school leaders match student needs to resources and approaches and execute interventions for off-track students. At all participating DATA Initiative schools, teacher teams will meet weekly during common planning time to plan from standards, ensuring they understand the

content they are going to teach. Teachers will create action plans based on student needs to personalize learning, and share instructional strategies across grade level teams to ensure the best strategies can be obtained from peers. As a result of these data teams, each teacher will receive regular data-driven feedback which will be used to group students into small group instruction or tutoring groups that are aligned to student-specific needs, whether students are struggling or if they are quickly mastering content. In addition, ALab schools will serve as a pilot for providing educators an additional cache of personalized instructional content and supports.

(c)(i-ii) With the establishment of the KMS, common assessment data will allow school leaders to view data across teachers and grades. This will help school leaders pinpoint resource allocation, target professional development to address trends across classrooms, and identify best practices in the highest-performing classrooms. Through the KMS, school leaders will also be able to track teachers' progress toward becoming effective and highly effective based on their students' progress on interim assessments, and provide regular feedback and support to help all teachers improve their practice to become more effective.

(d) The applicant considers that, with access to high quality, frequently-updated data and the use of teacher data teams, school leaders will provide feedback and support that can help most teachers develop the instructional capacities of effective and highly effective teachers. In addition, the KMS will house information on highly effective teachers (as measured by Compass) so that school leaders have the option of more effective use of high-performing teachers to teach more students or focus on high-need students.

The applicant provides a well-designed approach for teaching and leading. However, they did not include all the components of a high-quality plan (key goals, activities and rationale, deliverables, timelines, and persons responsible) to specifically address how they will increase the number of students who receive instruction from effective and highly effective teachers and principals, including in hard-to-staff schools, subjects (such as mathematics and science), and specialty areas (such as special education). As a result, the applicant receives a mid-range rating for this selection criterion.

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)

	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8

### (D)(1) Reviewer Comments:

The applicant provided information on practices, policies, and rules that facilitate personalized learning. a) The applicant discusses significant and comprehensive district overhauls that have transformed the district's leadership and governance. Specifically, the applicant relates that they no longer use a top-down central office organization but now have a governance structure that provides more autonomy to principals and focuses on the primary goal of supporting schools and raising student achievement. This innovative governance relies on three structures within the district reorganization - the network structure, the strategic initiatives unit, and technology infrastructure - to provide schools, students, and educators with the support they need to successfully personalize learning and ensure academic excellence for all students.

(b) The applicant reports significant and far-reaching changes in key policies to impact and expand the autonomy of school leaders. This includes a policy of mutual consent in hiring decisions which ensures that principals have the final say in who works in their school, and that an employee is not forced into a position they do not want. This policy has been reinforced through state law in Act 1. In addition, state law Act 1 further empowers school leadership teams by requiring that principals make staffing recommendations to the superintendent, and giving the superintendent final hiring authority (as opposed to the school board). Also, the district has given school principals the flexibility to make curriculum and scheduling decisions that best meet the needs of their students. Notably, by 2013-14 all schools in the district will have transitioned to school-based budgeting, which will allow school leaders to adapt funding to the needs of students in each building.

(c) Although the applicant reports that the Executive Director of Policy will develop rules and systems to ensure students can progress through the curriculum in ALab schools based on mastery, rather than the amount of time spent on a topic, and will work with ALab principals to ensure students can demonstrate mastery in multiple comparable ways, the specific activities and methods by which this will occur is lacking.

(e) The applicant did not address how they would provide learning resources and instructional practices that are adaptable and

fully accessible to all students, including students with disabilities and English learners.

The applicant has provided an approach, not a high quality plan, in response to this criterion. A high quality plan, for purposes of this competition, requires the development of key goals, activities and rationale, deliverables, timelines, and persons responsible that are specific to this selection criterion. The applicant receives a mid-range rating.

(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	6
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant envisions significant improvements to the district's infrastructure, particularly in the area of technology which will be infused into all initiatives of the four projects in the plan. Included in this discussion is a design for technical support and training. Specifically,</p> <p>(a) The applicant plans to ensure access to technology by providing computer kiosks at schools and the central office for parents and students without computers or reliable internet access at home to monitor student progress through the KMS initiative. More information is needed to determine if this includes course related content-related that students could access outside of school to support student learning and mastery.</p> <p>(b) The applicant intends on providing significant and comprehensive technical support ensuring that students, parents, and educators have appropriate levels of support. For example, eight technical support team members will be added to meet the 1:250 technician-to-computer ratio recommended for the initiation of blended learning programs. The technical support team will also work with students, parents, and educators to ensure that the knowledge management system is functioning smoothly and providing appropriate information to stakeholders in a timely fashion. One technical support team member will be dedicated to supporting the parent systems across the district, ensuring that parents will have access to relevant student data in the KMS. Students in ALab classrooms will be supported by newly hired paraprofessional ALab coaches and ALab teachers. Students and parents will have access to technology support outside of classrooms to ensure that they have a clear picture of which standards the student has mastered and on which parts they need additional support.</p> <p>(c &amp; d) The applicant sufficiently reports that KMS data will be integrated into a cloud-based warehouse and reported through a user-friendly web portal, from which parents and students will be able to export student information in an open data format.</p> <p>The applicant's description of the LEA and school infrastructure, does not include all components of a high quality plan (key goals, activities, deliverables, timelines, and persons responsible) as required in this selection criterion. The applicant receives a mid-range rating .</p>		

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	11
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant describes a far-reaching and comprehensive continuous improvement process that occurs at the classroom, school, and district levels. For example, by bringing the DATA Initiative to every elementary and middle school, the tools and processes of the data cycle - planning from standards, rigorous interim assessments, and collaborative data meetings - will be used to continuously adapt and improve instruction in every classroom. Teachers will work together across subjects and grades, with the guidance of principals, to drive continuous improvement at the school level. At the Acceleration Lab (ALab) and Intensive Community Partnership (ICP) schools, investments in technology and service delivery at the school level will reach every student, driving continuous improvement of the school as teams use these new resources to help all students make gains. Such continuous improvement in the classroom and at each school will drive improvement at the district level.</p> <p>The applicant has organized the performance indicators that will be used for continuous improvement by categories of input improvement (use of KMS by teachers), output improvement (school indicators are being met), and outcome improvement (district benchmarks and goals are being met). More description of this measurement process is needed. The KMS website will track (monitor) progress on each performance indicator (measure) against established benchmarks and goals. Annually, the district will hold a media event to discuss and disseminate (publicly share) district progress against the goals and indicators.</p> <p>The applicant receives a mid-high rating on this selection criterion.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant provides an adequate explanation of the strategies that will be used for ongoing communication and engagement with internal and external stakeholders. It is worthy to note that teachers, principals, students, and other stakeholders will be part of the development of the technological method of communication that will be used. These stakeholders will help choose measures presented on the user interface of KMS that will be most useful to help them track and accelerate student progress. Teachers and principals will also help select hardware and software for ALab schools and will pilot different hardware and software options and give feedback. As an additional source of input, the applicant plans to survey teachers, principals, students, and parents to determine what changes should be made to KMS to increase usability. The types of strategies for communication and engagement that will continue to be used that are non-dependent of KMS were not discussed.</p> <p>The applicant receives a mid-range rating on this selection criterion.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has included appropriate performance measures, overall and by subgroup, with annual targets. (a) The applicant selected 15 performance measures with a well-articulated rationale of why each performance measure was selected. For example, one performance measure was the percent of students retained in the grades 4-8. The end goal was for no students to be retained in grades 4-8 by 2016-17. The rationale was that the percent of students retained in the middle grades is a key indicator of a school's ability to effectively intervene to ensure that students are receiving the personalized services they need to succeed.</p> <p>(b) Supportive information was provided to clearly understand how the performance measures, which are rigorous, will be used in a timely manner, and will provide formative leading information tailored to the applicant's proposed plan and theory of action. For example, for the performance measure listed in (a) above, the applicant noted that fewer students being retained is an indicator that more teachers are providing differentiated, personalized instruction, and that students are successfully accelerating their progress (theory of action). The applicant also noted that reducing student retentions is an ambitious goal that will require changes in how students are taught and how they direct their own learning, which the district is making possible through the four projects and the plan to scale to other schools (proposed plan).</p> <p>(c) The applicant has appropriate plans for how it will review and improve the performance measures over time if they are insufficient to gauge implementation progress. Revision will be based on whether they are an accurate predictor of output and outcome measures. Specifically stated, if input measures do not predict some output measure, they will be revised; if output measures do not predict some outcome measures, they will be revised. Outcome measures will be revised if they do not predict high school graduation and postsecondary enrollment. Predictive value will be determined by the Strategic Initiative Unit's policy team using statistical modeling.</p> <p>The applicant receives a high rating on this selection criterion.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	5
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant articulated a solid evaluation plan. The applicant plans to use outcome data (end of year/end of grant timeline) combined with output data (data to differentiate instruction and whether educators are becoming more effective through their work with the DATA Initiative) to evaluate the effectiveness of its investments and process and develop plans to more effectively use resources.</p> <p>As the plan is instituted at different levels at different schools, the applicant will design the evaluation as a comparison of schools receiving different interventions. Each of the four projects of the plan will have its own evaluation design. For example, the KMS model will be evaluated based on usage. If teachers, principals, district staff, and parents find the system useful on surveys and through other qualitative evidence gathering, the system will be judged effective.</p> <p>For the DATA Initiative, the district will utilize the results of segments of an overlapping quasi-experimental evaluation, the i3 evaluation of ANet currently underway, to determine the effectiveness of the ANet partnership and the DATA Initiative in altering teacher and principal behaviors and increasing student achievement. Also, the applicant will use some existing output measures, such as looking at the fidelity of implementation at each school as measured on the ANet rubric and at the classroom level using the ANet element in the Compass rubric, to evaluate whether classrooms and schools with higher implementation fidelity have better results.</p>		

In evaluating the ALab Schools, the data and accountability office within the centralized Strategic Initiative Unit will conduct analysis of overall achievement in these schools on LEAP and iLEAP as well as analyzing progress on the CCSS-aligned interim assessments provided by ANet. It is believed that the resources that are used to extend the day and provide students with personalized learning should lead to rapid increases in student achievement at these schools. Based on successful findings, the applicant will look to scale the elements the evaluation reveals as the most effective to other schools in the district.

The applicant will determine the effectiveness of ICP schools by examining if they are more effective than demographically similar schools who are not implementing the ICP model and if they have successfully developed an improved Response to Intervention model that can be successfully scaled across the district. The applicant believes that success with this model of implementation could have significant impact on the district's improvement. For example, not only would it result in middle schools promoting all students to the ninth grade on time and on track to graduate college- and career-ready, but it could encourage accelerated achievement more widely across the district.

The applicant receives a high rating on this selection criterion.

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	10
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>(a) The applicant presents a well-developed budget that identifies all funds that will support the project and is carefully planned to reduce funding from year to year as the initiatives become more self-sustaining.</p> <p>(b)(i) The budget is reasonable and sufficient to support the development of the applicant's proposal. The applicant explains costs relative to all grant expenditures by overall budget costs per year. The total request for the four year grant period is \$29,850,047.81. Funds from other sources total \$8,290,918.00 for the four-year period. Funds for each of the four projects in the proposal are outlined by the project's name and includes funding for the requested Competitive Preference Priority, the structure of which is included in the activities of the Intensive Community Partnership (ICP). The greatest expenditures are for the eleven ALab pilots. Personnel include the project director, paraprofessionals, and teachers. Additional budgetary breakdowns are described for the four proposal projects by year. The budgetary breakdown does provide sufficient itemization to demonstrate how costs were calculated.</p> <p>(ii) One-time expenses include travel to visit/observe other ALabs, equipment for 11 ALabs, parent kiosk stations, and contractual services to purchase and implement a Knowledge Management System.</p> <p>The applicant receives a high rating on this selection criterion.</p>		
(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	6
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant presents a forward-thinking approach for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. The applicant states that they have identified several funding sources for sustaining the initiatives of the proposal after the grant ceases, including other federal funds, state funds, local funds, and foundation or other grant funds. The applicant demonstrates planning for sustainability by decreasing the amount of RTT-D funds requested each year of the grant. It is noted that, as the amount of RTT-D funds requested decreases, and the amount of funding from other sources increases. By year five of the grant, the applicant feels that they will be prepared to fully sustain the four projects of the grant without any RTT-D funds. The applicant also demonstrates planning for sustainability by including a table of projected expenses in the three years following the grant and the anticipated funding sources. While the district has a plan to sustain the major initiatives of the plan with existing funding sources, they believe that their ability to track data from all components of this proposal will make it likely the district will be able to attract external funding to build upon the successes of this plan. The applicant considers that each of the grant projects can be maintained over time by building them into the district infrastructure. The applicant also notes that since the grant proposal is aligned with the direction of overall state policy, state policies will continue to extend and support the district's work on these initiatives.</p> <p>The applicant has provided a solid approach for sustainability of the project's goals after the term of the grant. However, not all the components of a high quality plan are present. A high-quality plan requires the development of key goals, activities and rationale, deliverables, timelines, and persons responsible as applied to this selection criterion.</p>		



The applicant receives a mid-range rating on this selection criterion.

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	7

### Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:

(1) The applicant has developed a well-integrated project that supports the academic goals of the proposal. The Intensive Community Partnership (ICP) Schools project will place a site coordinator at six high-need middle schools to help organize existing community partnerships and create new ones. The applicant will contract with a community agency for these site coordinators. The site coordinators will connect selected high-need students to the additional supports they need to remain on track for success. As part of the ICP project, these schools will use intensive partnerships with community-based organizations to provide socio-emotional, behavioral, and health supports to their students, thus helping to ensure on-time promotion for every student. ICP schools will focus on increasing grade level achievement in math and ELA, bringing struggling students back to grade-level, and improving conditions for learning by providing teachers and principals with the tools to increase the effectiveness of their interventions.

(2) The applicant has determined a set of 10 population-level desired results for the project that appropriately align with and support the applicant broader proposal. For all students at the high-need Intensive Community Partnership Schools, and particularly for low-income or minority students, English language learners, and students identified as at risk of failure, the applicant anticipates seeing improvements in the categories of educational attainment, conditions for learning, and family and community.

(3) (a) The applicant has succinctly developed a process they will use to track results of this project. They will track results for all students in the district using the KMS, and the data will be available on a specific Partnership Dashboard for all students in ICP schools. Principals, school leadership teams, and teachers at ICP schools will be able to see individual student data for each student at their school. The KMS will be able to identify intervention categories based on a modified Response to Intervention model developed at ICP schools, which will then be used to target partnership services to high risk students.

(b) The applicant has identified a solid approach to target its resources to improve results. At the whole school level, the community-based organization, assisted by its site coordinators, will use the data in the KMS to help ICP Schools improve their RTI model. The KMS will group students into intervention categories. In ICP schools, these targeted categories will replace the traditional identification system used in RTI. With the new KMS identified risk indicators, all students in the top risk-categories will be referred to the Academic and Behavioral Intervention Team (A/BIT). Using the KMS behavioral, academic, and on-track indicators is a holistic approach that will ensure that all students needing services receive them as soon as they show academic or behavioral warning signs. The site coordinator will become a member of the A/BIT team, which includes teachers, counselors, administrators, and others, and will lead biweekly meetings to discuss students with off-track indicators.

(c) The applicant has put careful thought into a sound approach for scaling up the ICP schools. They report that schools implementing the ICP component will develop policies and practices for the foundation of the project which can be scaled to and replicated in schools across the district. The site coordinator will work with the Strategic Initiatives Unit to document practices of the improved RTI model in a manual that will be completed following the first year of implementation. This manual will form the basis of an attempt to scale the improved RTI system to ten additional schools during the 2014-15 school year. Additionally, the RTI tiered-selection process, to be updated to include non-academic ICP indicators, will be scaled for district use. Intensive scaling efforts will begin in earnest when the ICP model establishes a clear track record of success. The applicant notes that in the final two years of funding, the district and its community partners will focus on using existing funding streams and community partners to add more ICP schools.

d) Review of the provided table of the 10 performance measures and anticipated results over the four years of the grant show ambitious projections of improvement. For example, for the performance measure to reduce the number of students dropping out before the 9<sup>th</sup> grade, the applicant expects the number of students in ICP schools to drop from 50 to 0. Another stringent projection: of the 15% of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students who scored below basic on the 7<sup>th</sup> grade math assessment, 95% will advance to basic or above on the 8<sup>th</sup> grade assessment.

(4) The applicant describes a sufficient approach to integrating education and other services into the work of the ICP. The site coordinator will work with teachers and community partners to layer the appropriate academic and non-academic services for the student to ensure the student is back on track for promotion to the next grade. For example, students with off-track

indicators that do not respond to the small group interventions in Tier II need more intensive supports, and will be assessed for individual interventions by the site coordinator. The student will establish goals that need to be achieved (e.g., less fighting, not skipping class, improving a grade in their math class) and an individual service plan will be established.

(5) The applicant provides a solid structure for building capacity of staff in participating schools. For example, (a) one of the responsibilities of the site coordinator is to assisting the school’s leadership and teachers with professional development and programming, specifically focused on assessing student needs. Site coordinators will conduct a full assessment of school and student needs annually. This assessment will drive service provision around outcomes in seven areas: attendance, behavior, suspensions, academic achievement, promotion, graduation, and dropout.

(5)(b) The applicant describes a workable process for identifying needs of the school and community. They will contract with a community-based organization to provide coordination services in each ICP School. The community-based organization will provide a full-time site coordinator in each school who will lead the efforts to identify and inventory community-based resources that respond to whole school and individual student needs. The ICP school site coordinator will forge community partnerships that bring resources into schools that help address non-academic barriers to learning, such as unmet physical, psychological and social needs.

(5)(c) The applicant notes that one of the duties of the site coordinator is developing a system with school leaders to understand student needs and create a decision-making process to connect students to the right supports and services from community partners. It is unclear how this decision-making process will work to select, implement, and evaluate supports that address the individual needs of participating student. These specifics of this decision-making process are lacking.

(5)(d) Although coordination with families is an important part of this project, the applicant provides little information on this process. It is noted, that site coordinators will contact parents of case-managed students to seek additional at-home support for interventions at school, and will engage families to make decisions about improving student results over time. More information on this process is needed.

(5)(e) The applicant presents a tightly woven design for routinely assessing the progress in implementing its plan. This includes assessing the progress of individual students as well as the schools involved. For example, every two weeks, the site coordinator will review the performance measures for case-managed students and students identified by the KMS as “off track.” Adjustments will be made as needed, both to add services or discontinue or adjust unnecessary or ineffective interventions. An evaluation will occur at the end of each year by the SIU policy team which will look closely at the success of students in achieving individual goals as well as the primary goal of getting promoting to the next grade. Results of this evaluation will be used to reassign resources and resolve challenges at each school. In addition, data from the teacher, principal, student, and parent/guardian surveys will be used to monitor stakeholder satisfaction with the work of community partners and site coordinators. The project director will consistently check in with principals to ensure high-quality implementation and set expectations with community partners for the quality of the services provided.

(6) The applicant has aggressively set annual ambitious yet achievable performance measures and desired results for the project. Performance measures to be charted include: the percent of students dropping out before 9th grade decreases, the percent of students retained in middle school grades decreases, the percent of students who fail either a Math or an ELA course decreases, the percent of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students who scored below “Basic” on the 7th grade ELA iLEAP who advance to “Basic” or above on 8th grade ELA LEAP test increases, percent of 8th grade students who scored below “Basic” on the 7th grade Math iLEAP who advance to “Basic” or above on 8th grade LEAP Math test increases, the percent of decrease of students missing 17 or more school days, percent of decrease of students with one or more annual out-of-school suspension events, the number of fight events decreases, the percent of students who report on a survey that they feel safe at school and home increases, and the percent of students screened and appropriately treated for asthma increases. Some of the expected improvement are very dramatic. For example, the number of case-managed students who fail either a math or English core course will decrease from 36% to 0% in four years.

Because the applicant has substantially met most of sub-criteria of this selection criterion, they receive a high mid-rating.

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
--	-----------	-------

Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met
<p>Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The applicant has met the intent of Absolute Priority I: Personalized Learning Environments. The applicant has clearly demonstrated how it will build on the core educational assurance areas to create learning environments that are designed to significantly improve learning and teaching. For example, relevant to (1) adopting standards and assessments, the applicant reports that they are actively engaged in implementation of the Core Content State Standards (CCSS) and are a member through the state of the Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) assessments consortium. In addition, several schools in the district have implemented robust interim assessments through participation in the Achievement Network, (ANet). The applicant demonstrates through this proposal a commitment to build on those assessments by creating a data-driven culture at all elementary and middle schools, where all teachers plan from the CCSS and regularly assess student progress with aligned assessments. For personalization of the learning environment, the applicant's visionary approach for teaching and learning is that highly effective teachers use current and powerful data to personalize learning for each student and connect the student to a seamless network of supports, both academic and non-academic, that accelerate academic progress. The applicant cites several favorable conditions under which they have great flexibility in autonomy to implement personalized learning environments. For example, the applicant has transitioned to a innovative network (portfolio) model where school support is decentralized and tailored to support specific school and student needs. Under this model, principals are provided with autonomy to best serve the needs of their students and teachers, but are held to higher levels of accountability for improved results. In addition, the district is moving towards a well-regarded student-focused fiscal structure, a student-based budgeting system, ensuring that district resources are equitably distributed for the benefit of students, increasing transparency and providing greater autonomy for school leaders to make decisions in the best interest of their students.</p> <p>At the core of the applicant's proposal is the practice of using current, powerful data to drive instruction, including providing intensive professional development on the use of data and technology. This meets the requirements of the core educational assurance area (2) building data systems that measure student growth and success, and informing teachers and principals with data about how they can improve instruction. The applicant builds the data system through the the four projects proposed in this application. The foundation of the proposal is the first project, implementation of a comprehensive new Knowledge Management System (KMS) for all schools that integrates multiple data systems to clearly demonstrate student mastery of each common core-linked standard to students, parents, teachers, and principals. This system allows the district to follow the progress of all of the district's students and appropriately intervene if students are veering off track. This comprehensive system is designed to provide data for district-wide intervention to all 45,500 students. In the second project, Driving Achievement Through Analysis (DATA Initiative), teams of teachers and school leaders are taught to reflect on critical data from interim assessments and adapt instruction. The initiative builds on a successful existing partnership with the Achievement Network. ANet uses CCSS-aligned assessments combined with a cycle of teacher-team planning, assessing, intervening, and reflecting to drive school improvement and student achievement. The purpose of the third innovative project, Acceleration Lab (ALab) schools, is to identify intensive, personalized supports that will help students accelerate achievement and complete eighth grade on time and on level. This is accomplished by implementing blended learning, a combination of adaptive software with high-quality traditional instruction. Eleven high-poverty elementary and middle schools have signed up to form the initial group of ALab schools. The fourth ground-breaking project, Intensive Community Partnership (ICP) Schools, focuses on supporting high-need students both inside and outside of the classroom. In six high-poverty middle schools, the applicant will use existing resources as well as new school-based partnerships to meet students' academic, socio-emotional, and behavioral needs. To accomplish this, the district will contract with a community-based organization to place a credentialed social worker (called a site coordinator) at each ICP school to build school-wide awareness of the behavioral, physical, and mental health services available to students and to connect students to additional community partners. Through these four projects, the applicant intends to meet the requirements of the grant for personalized learning through the use of effective data systems and academic and non-academic student supports, as well as decrease the achievement gaps across student groups as they prepare students for meeting college- and career- ready standards.</p> <p>The applicant discussed several innovative strategies for meeting educational assurance area (3) recruiting, developing, rewarding, and retaining effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed the most. The applicant is currently in the final stages of developing a proactive performance-based compensation plan to attract, reward, and retain highly-effective teachers by January 2013. The applicant's sound rationale is that highly effective teachers personalize learning for students, accelerating achievement and closing gaps through their teaching innovations. In 2012, a principal accountability program was implemented requiring principals to hit performance growth targets in two out of three years. Reinforcing these sweeping policy changes is the implementation of a comprehensive performance management system for teachers and school leaders. Starting in the 2012-13 school year, teachers and principals will be measured with 50 percent of the evaluation based on student growth and 50 percent based on performance against the Danielson Framework for Teaching. Using student achievement results and nationally normed best practices contained in the rubric to conduct teacher evaluations will be a</p>		

powerful way to continuously manage educator performance and develop highly effective teachers. The district is also planning a concentrated focus on recruiting and rewarding effective teachers and principals by attaching performance-based compensation to the performance evaluations. The data culture described above is aptly designed help all educators develop the skills needed to be highly effective in the classroom, thereby increasing the number of students who have highly effective teachers and principals.

The applicant plans to meet educational assurance area (4), turning around lowest-achieving schools, by ensuring that the lowest-achieving schools will receive the first and most intensive support for this transformation. This concentrated support will be provided by the Acceleration Lab Schools, which consist of eleven elementary and middle schools including 6,004 students in Year 1 scaling to at least 22 schools and 12,000 students in Year 4. Additionally, six middle schools reaching 4,185 students the most highly impacted by poverty will receive increased supports for meeting students' non-academic needs through an emphasis on existing partnerships as well as new ones with community-based organizations through the ICP project.

For all subgroups and overall, the applicant has provided ambitious, yet achievable student performance measures, all of which either meet or exceed state targets. For example, in order to address the rates at which students graduate from high school prepared for college and careers, the applicant has included a performance indicator to measure the number and percentage of participating students, by subgroup, who are on track to meet college- and career- readiness standards by passing the Math and ELA assessment in the 8<sup>th</sup> grade and having never been retained. Also, the applicant has established a wide range of solid performance measures that will ensure that all schools, including the lowest-performing schools, will demonstrate continuous educational improvement.

The applicant has met the requirement of Priority 1.

Total	210	161
-------	-----	-----



# Race to the Top - District

## Technical Review Form

Application #0891LA-3 for Jefferson Parish Public School System

### A. Vision (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(A)(1) Articulating a comprehensive and coherent reform vision (10 points)	10	7

#### (A)(1) Reviewer Comments:

Section A1 provides an overview of the four core educational assurances originally identified in ARRA to support educational reform. The response demonstrates evidence of a vision for the district through an affirmation of the district's commitment to district to "recruit, develop, retain, and reward highly effective teachers," "ensure that educators have comprehensive data to adapt instruction," and the district's commitment to deliver supports consistently throughout the District. The district effectively demonstrated its commitment to the adoption of the CCSS and ultimate integration of PARCC through its adoption of ANET and ANET assessments. Based upon the district's description, these assessments are aligned to the CCSS. The district identified its commitment to addressing the needs of low performing schools through the district's initiative to close 9 underperforming schools and implementation of the "turnaround model" as required by the SIG grant. Although a reference to personalized learning is present, the district is lacking a definition of personalized learning and what is meant by "making large investments in human capital." The district is lacking a description as to how students will invest in their own learning and how this goal supports the described reforms.

(A)(2) Applicant's approach to implementation (10 points)	10	8
<p>(A)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district's approach is identified in years one and four; however, the proposal is lacking an implementation plan for years 2 and 3.</p> <p>The school district outlined an effective process for selecting schools to participate. Buy in was a factor when identifying the ALAB schools and documentation was provided to support the requirements of 70% teacher signatures for the ALABS and data initiative. It is noted that the finalized list of ALAB schools will be provided within 100 days of the grant receipt. A ranking system was established for ICP model middle schools. Scores with 1, 2, and 3 were included in the ICP model. The Knowledge Management System (KMS) will be applied district-wide. The services clearly target K - 8 as outlined in section A2. All schools meet the eligibility requirements as this is a high need school district with 76% of the students receiving free/reduced lunch.</p> <p>There is no reference to what schools who are not in the 59/65 selection will be doing to ensure that there is equity across the district. The proposal does not provide a plan for how the schools not identified will use Knowledge Management System (KMS) data since KMS will be brought to 100% of the students. The KMS initiative of 100% of the schools is aggressive in year one. The district does not elaborate on the Knowledge Management System (KMS) initiative and the proposal is lacking information on how it will make data usable for every school within the district. It is unclear as to who the responsible parties are, the specific timeline (other than year 1) and what work product will be delivered. The proposal lacks a description of what types of data will be shared with the teachers and/or a plan to use the data once received.</p>		
(A)(3) LEA-wide reform & change (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district indicated that the knowledge management system (KMS) will reach all students in grades K - 8 immediately upon implementation in 8/13. With the support of an identified specialist, the district noted that the use of data initiative will be scaled up to the high school level within 2 years of receiving grant funds. There is limited information as to how this will be accomplished outside of having a team within each high school.</p> <p>The district is a K - 12 district while the focus of the proposal centers on the K - 8 grade span: K - 8 for the Knowledge Management Systems initiative, the middle school grade span for the Intensive Community Support Schools, nearly all elementary and middle schools (59/65) through out K - 8 to participate in the data initiative, and 11 K - 8 schools participating in the ALab initiative. The scaling up initiative imbedded in the proposal will lead to 22 Alab schools after the 2nd year of implementation. In the scaling up initiative, the district identified a focus of using the Knowledge Management System (KMS) to improve Response to Intervention in Intensive Community Partnership (ICP) schools middle schools. A goal of this will result in a Best practices document that will be shared at the high school level. Additional details were needed as to the importance, impact, and goals of the scaling up initiative to the high school. The description provided was vague in reference to the need for such a document.</p> <p>Activities were established; however, the list was limited. (ie...A best practices manual will be established, ANET rubric elements will be incorporated into the Compass teacher evaluation rubric, purchase of computers for the implementation of PARCC assessment (The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers). Very little professional development opportunities were noted throughout this section.</p> <p>Although a preliminary specific person responsible was identified (ie. Data Leadership Specialist), no other specific personnel were identified. Teachers and leaders were continually referred to in this section; however, using those generalized labels resulted in this section remaining vague. This needed to be more thoroughly defined.</p> <p>A deliverable timeline was established for each of the initiatives(Data, ICP, and Alab); however, no specific timelines were presented for the implementation of the Knowledge Management System. Since this system will be delivered to 100% of the student population immediately upon implementation, this would require extensive organization and a comprehensive plan. It is a very ambitious goal. Although the timelines appear realistic, the lack of responsible parties, specific goals and activities for each initiative at varying intervals calls into question the realistic ability to adhere to the identified timelines. This response also lacks a concise rationale for activities and stages of implementation since there is a lack of clearly identified activities. The response does not support the value of meaningful reform.</p>		

(A)(4) LEA-wide goals for improved student outcomes (10 points)	10	6
<p>(A)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Goals were established for the district by individual subgroups as well as the overall growth of schools through performance targets. Charts in Appendix A indicate performance targets using the Value Added Model from 2010 until 2017 on the LEAP test in grades 4 and 8, iLeap in grades 2, 5, 6, and 7, and EOC in biology, Alg I, Geometry, and English II. The district indicated a 95% goal for graduation rate and postsecondary enrollment by 2017. All targets are aligned to statewide goals. The response is limited in how the district goals (ALab, ICP, Data initiative and KMS) will make the aggressive projected targets realistic in terms of proficiency rates, graduation rates, and postsecondary enrollment projections. No evidence is provided as to the expected outcome for each of the different initiatives. It is unclear as to if these goals are realistic.</p>		

## B. Prior Record of Success and Conditions for Reform (45 total points)

	Available	Score
(B)(1) Demonstrating a clear track record of success (15 points)	15	13
<p>(B)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This response reflects a very high standard. The response describes ambitious goals that resulted in increased student achievement. The JPPSS school district has demonstrated a clear track record of student achievement growth. Student achievement has risen at JPPSS over the past four year. For example, the multi-year subpopulation summary report in Appendix B demonstrates growth from 2008 to 2012. In 2011 - 2012, the district saw a 3 pt increase in proficiency on state assessments and that earned the district the title of the 4th most-improved school district in the state. Over the past 5 years, JPPSS ranks 3rd in academic growth on state assessments. Above average increases have been noted for students of color. The cohort graduation rates increased by 6.6% in JPPSS out performing the state. A 1.4% growth in post secondary schools between 2007 and 2011 was also noted.</p> <p>In addition, JPPSS embarked upon some ambitious and significant reforms in the lowest achieving schools. JPPSS has embarked upon the Turnaround model as required by the School Improvement Grant (SIG) grant. The district replaced Principals (22 were removed) and at least 50% of the teaching staff in 9 schools while extending the school day. The district has also developed a professional partnership with the University of Virginia to focus on district systematic change. The district has partnered with the Louisiana Department of Education (LDOE) to implement the Teacher Advancement Program and the district received the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) Grant. Furthermore, the Superintendent closed 9 underperforming schools and programs that were under-enrolled in 2011 - 2012. Four schools were also consolidated into two.</p> <p>Although the gains made are clearly successful and the reforms are aggressive and ambitious, it is unclear as to specifically how these goals were achieved. A reference to a principal with a "track record of improving student achievement" was identified as the person running the turnaround network; however, it is undocumented as to what that leader did to achieve such significant gains. It is unclear as to what specific supports the University of Virginia provided to the district to achieve such gains.</p> <p>JPPSS also makes their student performance data available to parents, educators, and administrators. The district posts student performance scores (SPS) in the local newspaper and on each school's web-site, school newspaper, and the district offers inter-district choice to parents. Teachers are required to create Student Learning Targets (SLTs) based on test scores and use data from interim assessments (including ANET assessments aligned to the CCSS). An Executive Director of Communications has recently begun revamping the district web -site to make data more accessible and friendly. No reference to how making the data available will lead to improvement in instruction, participation, or services.</p>		
(B)(2) Increasing transparency in LEA processes, practices, and investments (5 points)	5	1
<p>(B)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>No evidence of the district currently providing personnel and non-personnel costs at the school-level public was provided. A high level of transparency is undocumented.</p> <p>The district does share a budget book that details expenditures with parents, however, it is important to note that the district describes this document in a format that is not user friendly. In 2012, district salaries were published on Nola.com in response to a public records request by newspapers.</p>		

It is important to note that In the fall of 2011, the district was selected as 1 of 7 districts in Louisiana to participate in Student-Based Budgeting Pilot Program. This will allow for a more transparent budget process by providing principals with the opportunity to partner with parents and community members to set priorities. The district claims that this pilot initiative will make school budgets easy to understand and display how the funds are aligned to instructional strategies.

Finally, the response is lacking details as to how the KMS partnered with the Student Based Budgeting Program will enable the district to promote more transparent practices in the district.

(B)(3) State context for implementation (10 points)

10

7

(B)(3) Reviewer Comments:

The district has noted benefits from state supported initiatives such as: publishing resources and crosswalks for CCSS with grade level standards. Furthermore, the state of Louisiana has increased AP course offerings to allow for scaling up of the JPPSS K - 8 initiative, virtual learning opportunities for students, and college credit advancement to support personalized learning opportunities.

JPPSS identified ways in which the district has begun working toward meeting state goals of developing student performance into teacher, principal, and superintendent compensation. Such practices will be completed by January 2013. The plan is not without barriers between state regulations and district autonomy. The district noted that there is a need for additional flexibility from the state for differentiated learning environments. The district did indicate that current barriers can be eliminated through a state waiver. JPPSS will seek a waiver to provide differentiated learning environments including extended school days and a condensed accelerated curriculum.

A description is not provided in regard to now the district is utilizing state supported initiatives/services. The district also does not provide a detailed outline of what would be included in the Louisiana required waiver in order to effectively implement the plan.

(B)(4) Stakeholder engagement and support (10 points)

10

4

(B)(4) Reviewer Comments:

Evidence was provided as to discussions with teachers and principals that lead to the idea of the knowledge management system (KMS); however, the district did not define or provide details or an outline of how KMS will make data access in "real-time" or "easy to use." A Flyer to all teaching staff was provided in Appendix B. Signatures of at least 70% of the teaching staff (Appendix G) as well as community letters of support were provided in Appendix F. Network Executive Directors met to develop ALab plans and Intensive Community Partnership Schools were developed. Four principals in particular provided feedback regarding the structure of the extended school day model. The district demonstrated involvement at the principal administrative level.

The district attended and spoke with 4 parent organizations during their September meetings. In total, the district was able to meet with groups of 11 - 20 students and parents at each meeting. For a district of 46,000 students (the largest school district in Louisiana), the attempts to reach out to parents and students was inadequate. From the evidence provided, no more than approximately 80 parents district wide were reached.

The district did not provide any detailed information as to how community stakeholders were engaged in the process although emails and letters of support were provided. The letters provided support for the district's initiative but lacked feedback regarding the proposal.

(B)(5) Analysis of needs and gaps (5 points)

5

2

(B)(5) Reviewer Comments:

This response is missing elements of a high quality plan. Although general goals were identified, a thorough description of specific activities and the related timelines, persons responsible for implementation, etc... is lacking. For example, it is noted that teachers will work in teams; however, there is no mention of professional development needs, identification of resources such as the time when teachers will work in teams, when within the proposal timeline will teachers begin to work in teams (year 1, 2, 3..). Although general gaps and needs are identified such as the need: for stakeholder surveys, standardized assessments, consistent use of data, and the need for timely data, there is no detailed description of how such activities will be implemented into the school framework. It is noted that one goal for students is to personalize their own learning through goal

setting, determining the pace and curricula, but there is no description as to how this will be achieved. Baseline information is provided regarding: 4th grade on-time and on-level percentages, 11th grade ACT results 20 or above, as well as a cohort graduation rate, but there is no analysis of the future goals.

## C. Preparing Students for College and Careers (40 total points)

	Available	Score
(C)(1) Learning (20 points)	20	14
<p>(C)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This response requires the elements of a high quality plan. The district identified opportunities for training parents, teachers, and students in goal setting for student academic goals. However, it is limited in terms of timelines, resources, persons responsible for implementation, and a comprehensive list of goals needs to be further developed. The district provided a description of how the ALab will provide aligned CCSS digital content in a student self-paced format. No evidence was provided for supporting students with opportunities to be involved in areas of academic interest or having exposure to diverse cultures. The focus of learning activities was strongly based on digital learning content as well as college career readiness standards. Critical thinking and creativity opportunities were not discussed in depth.</p> <p>A complete description of how student learning will be supported by teachers in small group learning environments was provided. Evidence of using data to target specific needs was provided in the description of the Intensive Community Partnership Schools. It is also noted that in the ALab discussion section, evidence of progress monitoring through reporting systems and goal/skill target setting during common planning time in the data initiative was identified as well as opportunities to observe and visit schools with high quality systems was considered.</p> <p>The overall vision is appropriate and ambitious. It provides a focus for 11 high poverty ALab schools to pilot the use of the adaptive software before doubling the participation. As noted, the ALab opportunities will provide teachers "with an extra layer of data". This is beyond the ANET data initiative. The plan also presents a blend of small group traditional instruction that will complement digital instructional support. Both strategies will personalize instruction while providing opportunities for teachers to re-teach material as necessary.</p> <p>Accommodations were briefly explored in regard to English Language Learners and Special Education student needs. Native language support is reported to be available on many programs and resource room teachers and ALab paraprofessionals can potentially work together to complement the use of special education resource time in schools.</p> <p>The definition of "high-quality" instruction needs to be thorough defined. In this regard, no supporting evidence is provided to explain what is meant by high-quality.</p>		
(C)(2) Teaching and Leading (20 points)	20	17
<p>(C)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This response is of high quality. A unique activity of targeted webcast production for parents, students and teachers was discussed in regard to the use of the Knowledge Management System (KMS). A comprehensive description of the KMS was presented throughout this section. A very comprehensive description of student learning personalization through the use of data and resources was provided. Grade span, subject area, and timelines were provided as well as an overview of a format for teachers to pinpoint "precise aspects of the standards". A personalized learning, targeted instructional model with a feedback loop was described and achievable. Although ambitious, the outline provided is feasible. A process for implementing and supporting data teams was provided and appropriate.</p> <p>This proposal focuses on a K - 8 initiative and although "scaling-up" is noted, no discussion pertaining to on-time graduation was provided. A more in-depth description of persons responsible for each initiative is needed. The description for the creation of a high quality library of instructional resources was limited. The plan for increasing the number of students receiving instruction from highly effective teachers was limited; however, the response alludes to this aspect in its discussion of performance based evaluation system.</p>		

## D. LEA Policy and Infrastructure (25 total points)



	Available	Score
(D)(1) LEA practices, policies, rules (15 points)	15	8
<p>(D)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>An appropriate system for providing school leadership teams with flexibility and autonomy were presented. Principals have the ultimate say in who works in their schools; principals have flexibility to make curriculum and scheduling decisions to meet the best interest of students, and the Superintendent has been given the authority to hire staff based upon a principal's recommendation vs. the board of education .A timeline was provided regarding providing principals with autonomy practices. A strong emphasis of supporting systems to allow for data analysis was presented. The identification for persons responsible for implementation were noted in the ALAB and Intensive Community Partnership (ICP) school plans. Furthermore, a description was provided regarding persons responsible for implementing the Strategic Initiative Unit (SIU). Although the SIU "will have a lead role in the implementation of the RTT-D grant, no timeline was provided and an in-depth description of the activities was lacking. An insufficient plan for providing students with opportunities to demonstrate mastery in multiple ways was presented. No evidence of providing students with the opportunity to earn credit based on mastery was identified. A limited description of the "highly specialized" supports provided by the School Support Specialists (S3s) was provided. It is undocumented as to what the S3s will do with the "majority of their time on the ground at high-need schools." The components of a high quality plan as well as comprehensive school policies was vague. However, the description regarding infrastructure was appropriate.</p>		
(D)(2) LEA and school infrastructure (10 points)	10	7
<p>(D)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Reasonable expectations were described regarding interoperable systems such as the Knowledge Management System (KMS) to be supported by a cloud based warehouse that would allow parents and students to export student information as well as utilize text and email updates about achievement, attendance, behavior, and academic goal progress. Progress reports in each of the initiatives (data and ALab) will be supported through the KMS. These reports will be sent to parents electronically. Parents and students will be encouraged to access this data; however, strategies to encourage such access were not provided. To overcome technology based barriers, printed reports will also be disseminated to families. Support for schools will be provided through the hiring of 8 new technical support team members to maintain an appropriate 1:250 technician to computer ratio. To target parent professional development, coinciding events will be held during fall open-houses. This is a very feasible approach. The KMS will track parents who access the online data resources. This data will be a sound way to evaluate the effectiveness of this initiative. No discussion of support within the Intensive Community Partnership Schools was presented.</p> <p>Although descriptions of the activities and rationale were acceptable, there was limited information presented pertaining to allocated resources and timelines. Persons responsible for implementation were noted: the vendor for KMS pertaining to training, support and rollout, the Executive Director of Technology in the ALab schools will be responsible for purchasing 60 additional computers, as well as technical support and roll-out procedures in ALab schools. No documentation was provided regarding the persons responsible for hiring the 8 new technical support team members or paraprofessional ALAB coaches.</p>		

## E. Continuous Improvement (30 total points)

	Available	Score
(E)(1) Continuous improvement process (15 points)	15	8
<p>(E)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>The district provided an appropriate description of measuring outcome improvement through the analysis of whether students are on track and whether students who are behind are being caught up. The SIU policy team (using statistical modeling) will determine the predictive values. If values to not predict high school graduation and post-secondary enrollment, they will be revised.</p> <p>The "how" for inputs and preliminary outputs needs to be further defined. No procedure for monitoring collecting, sharing, and scaling best practices among teaching staff was defined. No system for measuring "high quality implementation and training" on the knowledge and management system (KMS), the DATA initiative, ALab schools or Intensive Community Partnership (ICP) schools was provided.</p> <p>The district provided information related to the continuous improvement process and an analysis of measures at the teacher, school, and district level. However, a description of such measures was undocumented.</p>		

(E)(2) Ongoing communication and engagement (5 points)	5	1
<p>(E)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Overall, this response is limited in nature. A limited description of communication was provided and a district reference to "other stakeholders" was not clearly defined. A description of the process or evidence as to how teachers, principals, and students will "help to choose measures" was insufficient. The term "measures" was not defined and therefore, led to an unclear description of how stakeholders will be engaged in the process.</p>		
(E)(3) Performance measures (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(3) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Fifteen performance measures were outlined in this response. A high quality plan requires a detailed rationale for each of the activities and goals. The district met these criteria successfully. Establishing focus groups and administering surveys will be very effective in measuring the plan's effectiveness. The district plans to implement four different types of surveys. This is an ambitious initiative because the district plans to implement them regardless of the award of grant funds. Collecting data from multiple sources in a district this size will result in an extensive data analysis process. Significant staff support will be required; however, it is achievable. The description of the goals established were reasonable: participating teachers logging into the KMS more than once a week by 2016-2017, increasing the percent of 3rd graders scoring basic or above in Math and ELA, and decreasing 4th grade student retentions. Sub-group performance measures were established pertaining to: K - 3 referrals and grades 4 - 8 out of school suspension, number of students by subgroup who are taught by an effective teacher or led by an effective principal, percent of students by subgroup scoring a 15 or above on the Explore Test in 8th grade, total participating students by subgroup passing the Algebra I End of Course Exam and the percentage of students by subgroup who are on-track and on-time in 8th grade. Although these goals are very ambitious, there are concerns regarding their realistic appropriateness of the established performance target percentages. To reach 100% success (or as represented in the chart - 0% who fail, or are retained, etc...) in each subgroup is an ambitious goal but unrealistic.</p> <p>Timelines were provided within each of the established goals. These timelines are ambitious and achievable. This response lacks a detailed description of persons responsible to evaluate progress and the overall collected data at both the building and district level. The district met the requirement of providing one age non-cognitive indicator of growth - focusing on the K - 3 students' overall physical and social well-being through the analysis of referrals.</p>		
(E)(4) Evaluating effectiveness of investments (5 points)	5	3
<p>(E)(4) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Evaluation of the Knowledge Management System (KMS) was supported with a reasonable descriptive process - surveys and qualitative evidence gathering measures. The evaluation process will include an appropriate comparison between ALab schools and Data Schools. However, the district's description of the Intensive Community Partnership (ICP) Schools' evaluation of Response to Intervention (RTI) was unclear.</p> <p>No evidence of utilizing community partners in the evaluation process was provided. Modification of schedules and structures was limited throughout this section. Publicly sharing data results one time a year during a media event demonstrates the public component of the evaluation process. The timeline presented demonstrates a detailed process of implementation and evaluation.</p>		

## F. Budget and Sustainability (20 total points)

	Available	Score
(F)(1) Budget for the project (10 points)	10	9
<p>(F)(1) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Funds were provided for the identified grant as well as sources outside of the grant. No identification of the destination for the 2 trips to visit ALab schools was provided; therefore, an evaluation of the appropriateness of \$1200.00 per trip was incomplete. An identification of the on-line licensed products was not provided; therefore, the appropriateness of the budgeted \$50.00 per student license is undocumented. All budgeted items support the implementation and sustainability of personalized learning environments. Appropriate descriptions of one-time investments and on-going expenditures were provided with each of the sections of the Project Level Budget Narrative with the exception of 7 salary and benefit items. Those 7 sections did not provide or indicate whether these funding needs will be a specific one-time investment or on-going expenditure plans.</p>		

(F)(2) Sustainability of project goals (10 points)	10	7
<p>(F)(2) Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>Title funds as well as LEA funds were identified to support the project 3 years beyond the length of the grant. Discussion was provided regarding the need for one less teacher, larger class sizes in order to maintain the initiatives. Involving principals as noted in the process makes this concept realistically possible. In addition, the district noted utilizing the consideration of community resource support when financially supporting Intensive Community Partnership Schools (ICP). Details regarding this plan were insufficient. When projecting the expenses of the awarded grant funds, the district provided evidence of how "funds from other sources" were going to be secured. These descriptions are justified; however, a description of what expenses would be cut in order to utilize these additional resources was not provided.</p> <p>The overall response lacked the specific details regarding persons responsible for implementation and oversight. The district developed a plan for "how the district will sustain the important work," but there was no mention of who in the district was immediately responsible to plan, target, or evaluate resources. The timelines, rationale and activities provided were appropriately described. There is a lack of detail as to what defines "high-quality software." Although specified, without a more thorough rationale, it is unclear as to how larger class sizes will be managed or impact the current district initiatives.</p>		

## Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)

	Available	Score
Competitive Preference Priority (10 total points)	10	9
<p>Competitive Preference Priority Reviewer Comments:</p> <p>This response is of high quality. The Intensive Community Partnership School initiative (ICP) will be targeted at the middle school level is JPPSS has one of the highest middle school drop out rates in the state - approximately 4% higher than the state average. Non-academic supports will be the focus of this initiative to "eliminate academic barriers to learning." The district effectively outlines their approach to targeting the needs of the most high need schools within the district.</p> <p>The district outlined uses of performance measures and performances targets to address and monitor successful implementation of this plan. Specific targets were identified and are appropriate for this community based initiative. These targets focus on 5 educational attainment goals, 3 conditions for learning goals, and 2 family and community goals which will target safety and physical health. The district identified the management system (KMS) which will record and track progress within each goal by student and identified population. Annually coordinators will conduct a full assessment of school and student needs. The site coordinator and principal will submit an annual site operations plan. Persons responsible for annual data analysis were effectively addressed. Through the utilizing of the RTI adaptive model (Tier I, II, and III) system established to monitor this plan, student progress was also effectively addressed. Individual student data will be analyzed every 2 weeks and adjustments will be made to individualized student plans as necessary using the RTI model.</p> <p>Within this plan, the data collection process was identified and it was noted that it would provide routine assessments. The tracking of student data will be used to assess effectively revise.</p> <p>This response does not define "community based organizations." However, the district does provide a limited outline of the "community based organization's responsibilities: provide a full-time site coordinator in each school to identify and inventory resources. The district has established a successful past practice track record for utilizing community resources and partnerships. The scaling up initiative was identified as an "easy" one in the proposal since relationships and a successful track record would have been established. There is concern, however, regarding no evidence of a pre-established community partnership dedicated to this specific initiative at this time.</p> <p>The district did provide an outline of the specific sources of community resources through a partnership with the Tulane School of Social Work, Jefferson Parish Human Services Authority, and the New Orleans Health Project mobile medical unit. The district provided a comprehensive and appropriate timeline for the project as well.</p> <p>Information pertaining to the training of the parents was lacking in this section. This is a critical piece as it establishes the foundation for parents to identify at-risk behaviors - as noted in the proposal. Evidence was provided regarding the necessary infrastructure supports to evaluate and address individual participating student needs as well as assessment student and district progress.</p>		

Absolute Priority 1

	Available	Score
Absolute Priority 1	Met/Not Met	Met

Absolute Priority 1 Reviewer Comments:

The absolute priority 1 was clearly met through the use of data via the Knowledge Management System (KMS), Data initiative, Intensive Community Partnership Schools (ICP), and the ALabs. Using ANET assessments, implementation of CCSS, and PARCC as a basis of identifying academic rigor as the foundation for this initiatives establishes a common language and serves as a foundation for personalized learning to take place. Establishing a performance based teacher evaluation system as well the Superintendent performance based compensation system are other strategies for ensuring that teachers are using personalized learning to reach high academic measurable outcomes through personalized learning strategies. Increasing the effectiveness of educators is evident through the implementation, support, and analysis work of data teams as well as the enhancement of Response to Intervention Supports in the ICP schools.

The priority description does lack information pertaining to how the district will ensure that students will have access to the most effective educators and does not reference a detailed plan for how educators will be addressed if they are found to be less than effective. Value added growth projections have yet to be developed; however, a plan was identified as well as the persons responsible for establishing these benchmarks.

The plan includes goals that target the increase of graduation rates and post-secondary enrollment and a plan to analyze the district's progress as well as opportunities to revise the district's plan was presented within the proposal. A focus on closing the achievement gaps within sub groups was also effectively established throughout the JPPSS proposal.

Total	210	140
-------	-----	-----